

Capt. Charles J. Taylor, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Clarence O. Sherrill, promoted.

Capt. Edwin H. Marks, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Michael J. McDonough, appointed colonel in the National Army.

Capt. Earl North, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Curtis W. Otwell, appointed colonel in the National Army.

Capt. Albert H. Acher, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Ernest D. Peek, promoted.

Capt. Gilbert Van B. Wilkes, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. George R. Spalding, promoted.

Capt. John C. H. Lee, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Paul S. Bond, appointed colonel in the National Army.

Capt. Frank S. Besson, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Elliott J. Dent, promoted.

Capt. Lindsay C. Herkness, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. William L. Guthrie, appointed colonel in the National Army.

Capt. Albert K. B. Lyman, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. William P. Stokey, promoted.

Capt. Frederick S. Strong, jr., Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Wildurr Willing, promoted.

Capt. Daniel D. Pullen, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. William A. Mitchell, promoted.

Capt. Carey H. Brown, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Mark Brooke, promoted.

Capt. Oscar N. Solbert, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Laurence V. Frazier, promoted.

Capt. Beverly C. Dunn, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. James F. Bell, promoted.

Capt. Donald H. Connolly, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Warren T. Hannum, appointed colonel in the National Army.

Capt. Raymond F. Fowler, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Robert R. Ralston, appointed colonel in the National Army.

Capt. David McCoach, jr., Corps of Engineers (General Staff Corps), vice Maj. Harold C. Fiske, promoted.

Capt. James G. B. Lampert, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. David McCoach, jr., retained in the General Staff Corps.

Capt. Philip B. Fleming, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Max C. Tyler, promoted.

Capt. John W. Stewart, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Julian L. Schley, promoted.

Capt. Joseph C. Mehaffey, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. William H. Rose, promoted.

Capt. Paul S. Reinecke, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Richard C. Moore, promoted.

Capt. Raymond A. Wheeler, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Lewis M. Adams, promoted.

Capt. W. Morris Chubb, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Charles R. Pettis, promoted.

Capt. Howard S. Bennion, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. W. Goff Caples, appointed colonel in the National Army.

Capt. William C. Sherman, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. William D'A. Anderson, promoted.

Capt. Rudolph C. Kuldell, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Ralph T. Ward, promoted.

Capt. Roscoe C. Crawford, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Henry C. Jewett, appointed colonel in the National Army.

Capt. Earl G. Paules, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Robert P. Howell, promoted.

Capt. Bradford G. Chynoweth, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Arthur R. Ehrnbeck, appointed lieutenant colonel in the National Army.

Capt. Milo P. Fox, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Joseph H. Earle, promoted.

Capt. John C. Gotwals, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Thomas M. Robins, promoted.

Capt. Francis K. Newcomer, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Roger D. Black, promoted.

Capt. Charles F. Williams, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Theodore H. Dillon, promoted.

Capt. Gordon R. Young, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. De Witt C. Jones, promoted.

Capt. Richard U. Nicholas, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Ernest Graves, promoted.

Capt. James A. Dorst, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Francis B. Wilby, promoted.

Capt. Rufus W. Putnam, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Clarence S. Ridley, promoted.

Capt. Lunsford E. Oliver, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Alvin B. Barber, promoted.

Capt. William H. Holcomb, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Jarvis J. Bain, promoted.

Capt. James B. Cress, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Thomas H. Emerson, promoted.

Capt. Charles P. Gross, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Roger G. Powell, promoted.

Capt. Bernard A. Miller, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Robert S. Thomas, appointed lieutenant colonel in the National Army.

Capt. Peter C. Bullard, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Harold S. Hetrick, appointed lieutenant colonel in the National Army.

Capt. Brehon B. Somervell, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. William A. Johnson, appointed lieutenant colonel in the National Army.

Capt. Xenophon H. Price, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Frederick B. Downing, appointed lieutenant colonel in the National Army.

Capt. Robert W. Crawford, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Edmund L. Daley, appointed lieutenant colonel in the National Army.

Capt. Frederick S. Skinner, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Henry A. Finch, appointed lieutenant colonel in the National Army.

Capt. Dabney O. Elliott, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. John N. Hodges, promoted.

Capt. Allen P. Cowgill, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. James J. Loving, promoted.

Capt. George F. Lewis, Corps of Engineers, vice Maj. Edward D. Ardery, promoted.

INFANTRY.

To be colonels with rank from August 5, 1917.

Lieut. Col. Oliver Edwards, Infantry (General Staff), vice Col. George B. Duncan, appointed brigadier general in the National Army.

Lieut. Col. Hugh D. Wise, Infantry (Quartermaster Corps), vice Col. Oliver Edwards, retained in the General Staff.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from August 5, 1917.

Maj. Oliver Edwards, Infantry (General Staff), vice Lieut. Col. Edward A. Shuttleworth, appointed colonel in the National Army.

Maj. Hugh D. Wise, Infantry (Quartermaster Corps), vice Lieut. Col. Oliver Edwards, retained in the General Staff.

To be major with rank from November 30, 1917.

Capt. Harry H. Pritchett, Infantry, vice Maj. James W. H. Reisinger, detailed in the Quartermaster Corps.

To be majors with rank from December 1, 1917.

Capt. Edgar L. Field, Infantry, vice Maj. Charles B. Elliott, resigned commission as temporary major.

Capt. Earl C. Buck, Infantry, vice Maj. Edmund C. Waddill, resigned commission as temporary major.

Capt. Jere Baxter, Infantry, detached officers' list, vice Maj. Arthur M. Ferguson, detailed in The Adjutant General's Department.

Capt. A. Ellicott Brown, Infantry, vice Maj. Harry Hawley, resigned commission as temporary major.

To be majors with rank from December 4, 1917.

Capt. James M. Lockett, Infantry, vice Maj. Jacob W. S. Wuest, detailed in the Signal Corps.

Capt. Eugene Robinson, Infantry, vice Maj. William W. Bessell, detailed in The Adjutant General's Department.

To be major with rank from December 10, 1917.

Capt. Jesse C. Drain, Infantry, detached officers' list, vice Maj. Joseph F. Ware, detailed in the Signal Corps.

To be major with rank from December 14, 1917.

Capt. Alexander W. Chilton, Infantry, detached officers' list, vice Maj. Alfred W. Bjornstad, promoted lieutenant colonel.

To be majors with rank from December 19, 1917.

Capt. William E. Morrison, Infantry, detached officers' list, vice Maj. Resolve P. Palmer, detailed in the Signal Corps.

Capt. Donald J. MacLachlan, Infantry, vice Maj. James G. Boswell, detailed in the Signal Corps.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 31, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Oh Lord, our Lord, incline Thine ear and hear our prayer. Help us to guide our frail bark along the turbulent and stormy sea of this life and bring us in Thine own good time to that haven of rest where all is peace and tranquillity.

The sands of life run swiftly, and no man knoweth when the call shall come. May we be ready to meet the summons with perfect faith and confidence in Thee our Father.

Comfort, we beseech Thee, the admirers, friends, colleagues, and the stricken family of the Senator who has passed on, under the dispensation of Thy providence, to the larger life in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following requests for leave of absence.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOORE of Indiana requests leave of absence until February 5 for the purpose of responding to a subpoena to testify in the United States District Court for the District of Indiana on February 1.

Tom D. McKEOWN asks leave of absence, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests will be granted.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 3135. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project, Arizona."

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 195. Providing for the sale of the coal and asphalt deposits in the segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations.

CIVIL-SERVICE EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 117, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution amending the act of July 2, 1909, governing the holding of civil service examinations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, the title does not give any information as to what the resolution is.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act of July 2, 1909 (36 Stats. L., No. 1), is hereby amended so as to permit the United States Civil Service Commission, during the period of the war, to hold examinations of applicants for positions in the Government service in the District of Columbia, and to permit applicants from the several States and Territories of the United States to take said examinations in the said District of Columbia. Said examinations shall be permitted in addition to those required to be held by said act of July 2, 1909 (36 Stats. L., No. 1).

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, insert after the word "the" and before the word "war" the word "present," and on page 1, line 10, after the word "Columbia," insert the words "and elsewhere in the United States where examinations are usually held," and at the end of the resolution insert the following proviso: "Provided, That nothing herein shall be so construed as to abridge the existing law of apportionment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if this is an unanimous report.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. Yes, sir; it is the unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman think this will take a great length of time?

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. No, sir; I do not think it will; it should not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the report is very illuminating. It gives no reasons whatever for the enactment of this legislation. It simply states that the committee make certain amendments to the resolution as it passed the Senate. Will the gentleman inform the House, which might have been done in the report, as to what is really accomplished by this resolution?

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. This is in response to a unanimous request from practically all the departments of the Government and the Civil Service Commission, and it does not do away with the law of apportionment, but simply for the period of the war permits examinations to be taken in the District of Columbia and elsewhere where civil-service examinations are usually held.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has not the Civil Service Commission that authority to-day?

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. Yes, sir; they have the authority and they are holding examinations throughout the United States every 10 days, but under some misunderstanding hundreds of people qualified to enter the service came to the District of Columbia, and they are to-day ready to serve the Government, but can not take the examination without being required to go back to their respective States, and it is considered by the department a hardship under present circumstances. This permits examinations to be taken here in the District of Columbia. That is all there is to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is not the gentleman in error when he says the present law forbids any person who is a resident of another State, and who is temporarily domiciled in the District, from taking an examination for the civil service here in the District?

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. I did not catch the question. What is the question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Is not the gentleman in error when he says that the present law forbids any person who is a resident of another State, and who is temporarily domiciled in the District, from taking an examination for the civil service here in the District?

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. No, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. And is not the purpose of this resolution only to do away with the limitation that was passed some years ago as to apportionment?

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. No, sir; this resolution does not affect or abridge the law of apportionment.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. If the gentleman will permit, I will give a concrete illustration of this.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. I can give the information. The law of apportionment holds as under the present law, but under the present law any citizen abiding or domiciled here could not take examination in the District, but he is required to go back to his State and this resolution saves that extra time and expense. This is for the period of the present war.

Mr. KITCHIN. Do I understand also that the examinations will be held in the States?

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. They will be held in the States simultaneously.

Mr. KITCHIN. At the same time they are held in the District?

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. Yes; at the same time.

Mr. KITCHIN. The result is that a man who is here domiciled, say from Texas, will not be required, as he would be under the law, to go back to Texas to take this examination, nor if this passes will the man in Texas be required to come here. The Texas man who is domiciled here can take it here and also the man in Texas can take the examination there?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will say to the gentleman—and it was the basis of my question—that I know of instances where persons in departmental service here, whose homes are in Wisconsin, have taken examinations for positions in the classified service here in the District.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. They took them contrary to the present law. If they were bona fide citizens of the State of Wisconsin, they should have gone back there, under the present law, to take the examination. But now if you have citizens of Wisconsin living here temporarily during the period of the present war, they may take the examination here, but they will be charged to the State of Wisconsin, and the law of apportionment will not be abridged.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the only purpose of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Is not this the situation, too? There are many men, a large number of them, in the classified service who come from several States of the Union and have lived here a long time, but still claiming residence in the State from which they came. They have families—young men and young women who have grown up—and it seems to be the desire of almost every one of them to get into the public service. In those cases, where the father continues to claim his residence in the State from which he came, his children are held to be residents of that State and must return to that State if they wish to take the civil-service examination.

Now, there are thousands of those, whole families, just falling over themselves trying to get into the public service, and this would remove the restriction. Thousands of them are waiting anxiously to get the opportunity to take this civil-service examination here, all cocked and primed and ready for it, and they will get into the public service if this restriction is removed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I object.

"GARABED" PATENT—CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 274).

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call up the conference report on House joint resolution 174.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 174) for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, for lessening the expenses of the war, and restoring the loss caused by the war by providing for the employment of a discovery or invention called the "Garabed," claiming to make possible the utilization of free energy.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement was read.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to House joint resolution 174, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7, and agree to the same.

CHARLES B. SMITH,
ROBERT CROSSER,
JOHN I. NOLAN,

Managers on the part of the House.

OLLIE M. JAMES,
T. P. GORE,
FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the resolution (H. J. Res. 174) for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, for lessening the expenses of the war, and restoring the loss caused by the war by providing for the employment of a discovery or invention called the "Garabed," claiming to make possible the utilization of free energy, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on:

The House receded from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 1, striking out "a" and inserting "his." This makes the resolution more definite as to the discovery or invention to which the proposed assignment relates.

The House receded from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 2, inserting the words "and that it can substantially effect the purposes set out in section 1 of this resolution."

This language simply makes more certain, if possible, that Mr. Giragossian will be required to substantially prove his claim. The House likewise receded from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 3. This amendment is exactly the same as No. 2, and was inserted in order to carry out the purpose of the amendment throughout the section.

The House receded from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 4. This simply inserts the words "first and" before the words "original discoverer." The object of the amendment can only be to emphasize the necessity of Mr. Giragossian's being found to be the original discoverer.

The House receded from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 6. It simply inserts the words "as aforesaid" for the purpose of referring more definitely to the preceding language.

The House also receded from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 7. This amendment inserts the words "and ownership." Since the preceding language provided for the "right and title" to the "exclusive use," the words "and ownership" simply carry out the apparent intention of the language of the resolution as it passed the House.

The amendment from which the Senate receded is No. 5. The language of this amendment is as follows: "And if the Secretary of the Interior accepts the assignment of the use of said invention as provided in the first section hereof."

The House believes that this amendment would create an inconsistency in the resolution. The resolution, and particularly

section 3 thereof, provided for the demonstration of said discovery or invention to a commission of five eminent scientists, who must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. These scientists are required to certify that the discovery or invention is practicable; that it can substantially effect the purposes set out in section 1, and that Mr. Giragossian is the first and original discoverer. Then, and only then, does Mr. Giragossian receive protection against infringers. If, however, in addition to the finding and certification of the commission of eminent scientists in regard to the originality and practicability of the discovery or invention, it were made a condition precedent to Mr. Giragossian's receiving protection that the Secretary of the Interior should accept an assignment of said discovery or invention for the Government's own use free of charge, then the finding of the commission of eminent scientists, if favorable to Mr. Giragossian, would not make certain the protection he seeks.

CHARLES B. SMITH,
ROBERT CROSSER,
JOHN I. NOLAN.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution, as it has been changed by the agreement between the conferees of the two Houses, is in practically the same form as when it passed the House. These six amendments which have been added by the Senate and to which the House has agreed really do not change the meaning at all, and inasmuch as they make no substantial change we saw no reason for disputing about them indefinitely.

The Senate did, however, incorporate an amendment, No. 5, which, while it may seem unobjectionable, would nevertheless create an inconsistency in the resolution itself if it were permitted to remain.

The House will remember that the chief purpose of the resolution as the House passed it was the creation of a commission composed of scientists satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and Mr. Giragossian, and these scientists were to determine the validity of Mr. Giragossian's claim. If it should be found by them that his discovery or invention is practical and can substantially accomplish the purpose recited in the preamble, and if he should be found to be the original inventor thereof, then their certificate to that effect would give Mr. Giragossian the protection that he desires. But the Senate, apparently unmindful of the provision in regard to the certificate of the commission of scientists, incorporated in the resolution this language:

And if the Secretary of the Interior accepts the assignment of the use of said invention as provided in section 1 of this resolution.

Then Mr. Giragossian is to receive protection. That would nullify the effect of the finding of the commission of scientists and create an inconsistency in the resolution itself. The Senate, therefore, properly receded from its amendment in order to make the resolution accomplish its original purpose.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I am told that Mr. Giragossian has made application and received a patent.

Mr. CROSSER. No; he has not.

Mr. TOWNER. That statement is not true?

Mr. CROSSER. It is not true.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. The Senate amendment No. 2 reads as follows:

And that it can substantially effect the purposes set out in section 1 of the resolution.

Mr. CROSSER. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. Now, what are "the purposes set out in section 1"?

Mr. CROSSER. For my own part I think it is absolutely useless language. It was provided originally in the resolution that he should make a demonstration, and if it should be proven that the discovery or invention is practicable and that he is the original discoverer or inventor, then Mr. Giragossian would receive the desired protection.

Mr. NORTON. As a matter of fact, is not that wording of that amendment nonsensical?

Mr. CROSSER. It does no harm, and we did not like to quarrel with the Senate about it. It simply emphasizes the meaning of the resolution, and to that I do not object.

Mr. NORTON. It is not set out in the resolution.

Mr. CROSSER. It is in the preamble.

Mr. NORTON. The preamble is not of itself a part of the resolution.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON. In the original resolution when first presented was an appropriation asked for?

Mr. CROSSER. No; not a cent, and not a cent is asked now.

Mr. DICKINSON. When this resolution was first before the House, did it not contain an appropriation?

Mr. CROSSER. No; never a cent has been asked in the resolution. There has never been any appropriation asked.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me some time?

Mr. CROSSER. How much time does the gentleman desire? This is a matter which has been debated two or three times before the House. I want to be courteous and fair to the gentleman, but I do not think the House wants to hear a repetition of our views on this matter, important as are the views of the eminent scientist from Wisconsin and delightful as it might be to listen to him. But what can it add? I will give the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I should like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. CROSSER. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, when this resolution passed the House it was expected by its opponents, especially in view of the fact that it had been virtually vetoed by the President of the United States, that before it was returned to this body it would be in a better form in protecting the interests of the Government than in the form it was passed in the last session of Congress, when it was pocket vetoed by the President. I will not say that the other body did not attempt to improve this bill. A study of the record shows that perhaps that was their intention; but, whatever their purposes may have been, the amendment of the Senate to which attention has been called by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] accomplishes no purpose. It says:

And that it can substantially effect the purposes set out in section 1 of this resolution.

There are no purposes set out in section 1. Now, if it were the purpose of the other body to have this patent granted by congressional action only in case this discovery would substantially accomplish the purposes set out in the title, which is not a part of section 1, then I take it that the conferees should have attempted at least to modify the language so as really to strengthen the resolution rather than to leave it in the air, without any protection whatsoever to the Government. I heartily agree with the gentleman having the bill in charge [Mr. CROSSER] that the bill in its present form, even though there is some change in phraseology, is practically the same as it left the House; but I am also certain that the bill in no wise protects the interests of the Government any more than the bill that was originally sent to the President in the closing days of the last session. In view of this precedent that we are establishing, and not safeguarding the interests of the Government, I have good reason to believe that the President of the United States will return this bill with a veto, so that more than one-third of the membership of this House may register disapproval of it in its present form.

The only change which strengthens this bill over that which passed the House in the prior session is that it must be satisfactorily shown to this committee of experts that Mr. Giragossian is the original, the first discoverer of this invention. There is this other change which weakens the protection of the Government, and that is that if the Government of the United States wishes to purchase this patent it must exercise that privilege while the Congress is in session, and at a price to be determined, not by a committee of six, of whom three shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and three appointed by the claimant, as originally provided, but that the award of that committee must meet the approval of this inventor; and if the award does not meet the approval of this inventor he can hold up the patent and not permit it to be purchased by the Government of the United States for the benefit of all the people of the country.

I rise at this time merely to call attention to the fact that this bill substantially is in no wise different from the bill that was vetoed by the President of the United States except in one particular, that this committee of scientists must determine that Mr. Giragossian is the first and original inventor. Other than that the protection to the Government provided in the original bill is weakened. I hope the conference report will be rejected, and if not, that the President will do as he did before, that he will veto this resolution and send his reasons to the Congress, so that we may know what the real reasons of the President were in refusing to affix his signature to the resolution presented to him two days before the adjournment of the last session of Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] in reply to the question of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] stated that amendments No. 2 and No. 3 referred to something set out in the preamble. I want to inquire of the gentleman where the preamble is.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no preamble. Not only that, but the title, which does set out some purposes, is not a part of section 1. The title, it is true, does set forth some purposes, and if these amendments inserted by the Senate and agreed to by the conferees had referred to the title, they might have some meaning and effect; but when we read section 1 we find there is nothing in it that refers to the attainment of the purposes of this invention. The title says it is—

For the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, for lessening the expenses of the war, and restoring the loss caused by the war by providing for the employment of a discovery or invention called the "Garabed," claiming to make possible the utilization of free energy.

But that is not section 1. Section 1, after the enacting clause, says:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept, as trustee for the United States Government, from Garabed T. K. Giragossian an assignment of the right to utilize for the Government's own use his discovery or invention, to be known as the "Garabed." Said assignment to and utilization of said discovery or invention by the United States Government shall be free of charge or expense.

Not a word that can in anywise be construed as setting forth the purposes of this resolution. Why, it is ridiculous. This whole resolution seems to have been framed at the dictation of the inventor.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. NORTON. I want to get a couple of minutes in my own time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING. Has the gentleman any inside information or otherwise as to whether this free energy is going to be untaxed?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have this information, that only a few days ago, before the Committee on Appropriations, I inquired of a distinguished scientist, Dr. Stratton, head of the Bureau of Standards, and he called my attention to the fake Keeley motor and told how the head of the physical science department of Johns Hopkins University ridiculed that invention, and asked, upon a demonstration by the inventor, whether he could cut the wire which carried the electricity that started the motor; and when Dr. Rowan was refused that privilege of course the Keeley motor went up in the air; and after hearing the statement of Dr. Stratton before our committee my opinion is that this is nothing more than a fake to exploit the public to the extent of millions and perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. WALSH. Since there is no purpose set out in section 1 of this resolution, and the second amendment says that it shall substantially effect the purposes set out in section 1, that means that even though it accomplishes no purpose, even if he demonstrates that it accomplishes nothing, the Government can take it over.

Mr. STAFFORD. He gets his patent if it accomplishes nothing. That is the effect of it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman understand that the purpose of this is to bring the war to a speedy conclusion, and that as soon as the bill is passed the war will close?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the claim of the promoter, but I have heard such claims not only in war times but in peace times; and, being of a skeptical mind, I have not given serious consideration to them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman kindly make a note of the date that this bill passes? And one month thereafter the war will close.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has to have the approval of the President, and I have every expectation that he will veto it again, especially as it is in the same form as when it was presented to him, without any safeguards to the public or the Government.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I do not agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that this conference report should be defeated. I can not understand to save my life why any Member of this body will now seek to postpone favorable action upon a measure like this. The inventor of this wonderful machine is an Armenian, now an American citizen. His people have long

been persecuted by the Turks, and he believes that he has an invention that will help us to speedily win the war against the Turks and their brutal allies, and, gentlemen, I believe that he has exactly what he claims to have. He wants protection in this matter from the Government, and he is entitled to it. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] says it is a fake proposition. How does he know? Some people once said that the operation of the telephone was a fake and that the electric telegraph was a fake, that the flying of aeroplanes heavier than air was a fake. All these things have proven to be realities and wonderful agencies of man. Here is a machine, it is said, that will fly an aeroplane indefinitely, and that is what we want above the trenches of the German Army. [Applause.]

The American people are growing impatient with gentlemen who want to halt legislative action looking to the inauguration of machinery that will conquer the German Army. The Government wants to hurry the war through, and this man's proposition will speed it to a victorious end. As amended it will meet the approval of the President.

Why, gentlemen, you remember our experience with the Lewis machine gun. I understand that it was submitted to our Government, but it was not accepted, and the inventor sold it to England. This man will go to some other country with his invention if it is not accepted here. Will gentlemen force him to do that and take the responsibility of losing to our country the possibilities of this very remarkable invention? Let us adopt the conference report and give to our Government the use and benefit of this invention. [Applause.]

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to defend the President of the United States from the unwarranted attack which has been made on him by the gentleman from Alabama. He says he can not understand how anyone can postpone for a single minute this great discovery, and yet the President of the United States, by a pocket veto of this bill, postponed it for several months. If the President of the United States can postpone the operation of this great invention for months this House can postpone it for two or three days in order to get the bill in such shape that it will not make Congress ridiculous. That is exactly what it does in accepting the amendment—"and that it can substantially effect the purposes set out in section 1 of this resolution." There is not a line or a word in section 1 that discloses any purpose of any kind. The conference committee has seen fit to accept this absurdity, and they have rejected one amendment made by the Senate that certainly should be incorporated in the bill, namely, "and if the Secretary of the Interior accepts the assignment of said invention as provided in the first section hereof."

Have you not confidence enough in the Secretary of the Interior to believe that if here is a practical discovery—something that will be of benefit to the Government or the people—that he will accept the assignment, and if he refuses to accept it that there will be good ground for such refusal. If he refuses, then should Congress give this man this exclusive right? I say, no. Mr. Speaker, this conference report should be rejected. It will only mean deferring it for two or three days so that the bill can be put in proper shape where we all can vote for it.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker: The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] throws a bouquet to Secretary Lane. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the only two amendments that were suggested by Secretary of the Interior Lane, were accepted by the committee and written into this bill by the action of this body. When that was done, the resolution was put into the form which the Secretary of the Interior had stated would be acceptable to him. It is well to have in mind this fact in view of the strictures that have been passed upon this measure.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], who has been associated with a good deal of the opposition to this resolution, has illustrated again to-day, as he has done heretofore, that he will not read the resolution. How does the gentleman propose to discuss intelligently a resolution or its effect, if he will not acquaint himself with its contents and purposes? [Applause.]

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] stated that one-third of this House heretofore registered its opposition to the resolution in the form in which it passed this body. That is only one of the numerous mistakes made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. So far from one-third of the House having registered its opposition to this resolution I call the attention of Members to the fact that when this body passed this resolu-

tion, the gentleman demanded a roll call, and precisely 14 of his colleagues registered themselves in the negative. A few days ago when we passed this resolution for the second time, after the amendments were inserted that were suggested by the Secretary of the Interior, the gentleman did not dare to call for the yeas and nays, so decided was the sentiment of the House in favor of the passage of the resolution. [Applause.]

What the gentleman had in mind was the vote on ordering the previous question, and not the vote on the passage of the resolution. The friends of the measure would have welcomed a call for a record vote, but the gentleman was too prudent to ask for that action, having in mind the vote of the last session.

I desire to repeat the statement heretofore made, that if there is anything of value in this alleged discovery the United States Government is given full opportunity to purchase the same and put it on the market for general use. If the committee of scientists provided for in this bill, should report that this discovery is all the inventor claims it to be, everyone will agree that the Government should take advantage of its option of purchase. The resolution provides that the Government of the United States may acquire this discovery upon the terms which it affords. Should this committee of scientists report that this alleged discovery is a fake, a Keeley fake, if you choose, then the United States will not be in any wise bound to take over the invention, or remunerate the inventor. We simply will not buy it, that will be all. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] referred to his conversation with some scientists who bracketed Mr. Giragossian with Mr. Keeley, of Keeley motor fame. Did that distinguished scientist in the course of a conversation intended to deride this inventor, refer in any wise to the Langley aerodrome, the prototype of the aeroplane of to-day, and the recipient of much scientific derision in its time?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. He did say specifically that he had no faith whatsoever in this Giragossian device.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I ask the gentleman whether that scientist referred to the Langley aerodrome, the forerunner of the modern successful flying machine? Prof. Langley died almost of a broken heart in consequence of the ridicule heaped on him by the writers and scientists of his day, who undertook to demonstrate with the precision of a mathematical demonstration that aerial flight by a machine heavier than the air was physically impossible. To-day thousands of these machines are flying in every quarter of the world.

Mr. STAFFORD. The head of the Bureau of Standards, Dr. Stratton, was asked as to what his view was as to this invention and he said he had no faith whatsoever in it, and that it was allied to the Keeley fake motor.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes, the gentleman has put that statement into the Record three times, but I am trying to test out the value of criticism of this character, recalling the numerous mistakes that these scientific gentlemen have made in the past. I ask the gentleman again, whether Dr. Stratton said anything about the fake Langley aerodrome, for that in its day, particularly after it fell in the river, was regarded as a sort of scientific monstrosity.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; we were not talking about that.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. There are many other scientific discoveries which in their struggling infancy, were the subject of much scientific ridicule, but which in the result made good.

Mr. STAFFORD. He was confining his attention to this matter, which it is claimed develops energy without any outside power.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I ask the gentleman from Ohio to yield me one minute more.

Mr. CROSSER. I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Of course the distinguished gentleman referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin, was trying to ridicule this invention out of court, so to say. He did not take up the general subject of scientific mistakes. Harvey's claims with respect to the circulation of the blood, were vehemently derided when first mentioned.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I notice that this continually refers to the purposes set out in section 1 of the resolution. I have read section 1 and I do not find that it sets out any purpose.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Oh, that point has been discussed heretofore.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am making my inquiry in good faith. I would like to have the gentleman's view on that.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I can not discuss in half a minute a proposition that has already been debated. My time is too short for that. These gentlemen seem disposed to heap abundant ridicule upon an amendment which was added in the Senate. Would they have us believe that the great body at the other end of the Capitol would propose an utterly ridiculous and absurd amendment? Why, I reject the suggestion! It is lese majesty.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I frankly confess that I do not know a blessed thing about Garabed, but that apparently does not disqualify one from discussing it. I hope, at least, I would like to hope, that such an invention is possible, because I have firm faith that whatever enables us to send these scores of thousands of aeroplanes that my eloquent friend HEFLIN tells us about over the German trenches will be of value and hasten the settlement of the war. I sincerely trust that it will all fall out as he predicts. I may have doubts, but I shall smother those doubts for the time being.

Mr. Speaker, this thing, I understand, exists in the air, but I want to get down to the earth for a moment or two and say something with reference to the military camps in Texas, where we are training young men for service in the air over those same German trenches that have been referred to. In view of some things that have recently been said about conditions in certain camps in Texas, I take this occasion to read to the House, with a view of putting it into the RECORD, a letter which I think is an adequate defense of those camps against some of the slanders that have been heaped upon them. This is a letter from a reputable merchant in my State and district. He writes:

LAMPASAS, TEX., January 26, 1918.

HON. JAMES L. SLAYDEN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I notice in the Houston Chronicle an address to Congress by Senator CHAMBERLAIN, wherein he is reporting a deplorable condition in the various Army camps.

This letter is prompted in part to do the officers in charge a justice and prompted still more by a desire to reach the parents of the young men now in the training camp. There is no doubt in my mind but what the conditions have been materially improved over what they were.

It just happened so that my son Albert, who has just been appointed to a position at the officers' training camp, Camp Bowie, wrote me the letter which I herewith inclose you. This young man has never had any hardships in his life. On the other hand, he has not been pampered, and I will quote you his exact words, which are as follows:

"I like the camp fine. We work from 5.45 a. m. until 10 p. m. Every minute is taken. I never worked so hard in my life, but it is fine. It is as cold as can be, but we are so busy we can't get cold, and we have good, warm clothes. I sleep on a cot on a sack full of straw, then I have two pair of Army blankets and five big Army comforts. I also have a raincoat, an overcoat, two suits of woolen O. D.'s and all the underclothes and socks I need. We also have all the grub we need; not fancy, but substantial. It sticks to the ribs. We have Army grits, bacon, light bread, beans, beans, and beans. When I get out of here I am going to be strong enough to go lion hunting with my fist. I like it fine."

I feel sure no special favors have been shown my son, and I want the parents of all these young men to feel as I do, that their sons are not in training for a picnic, but for the most serious duty that has ever confronted our people as a Nation, and that their boys are receiving the exact consideration, training, and treatment as accorded my son.

Most respectfully,

D. CULVER, JR.

I hope the sarcastic reference in the boy's letter to his father to the diet of Boston will not cause any hostility in the breast of any of the gentlemen from that celebrated city.

Mr. GILLETTE. Is the boy who writes the letter an officer?

Mr. SLAYDEN. No; he is not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the gentleman who proposes this invention is an Armenian or Italian or belongs to any other race does not excuse the House of Representatives from passing legislation, a part of which must appear ridiculous and without meaning to any intelligent person who may read it carefully in an effort to understand it. When the resolution was before the House I proposed that an amendment be added after the word "invention," in line 7, section 1, that amendment to read:

To make possible the storage and utilization of free energy.

That describes, as nearly as I have been able to ascertain, what this invention is claimed to be. Nowhere in the resolution, excepting in the title, is it stated what the invention is or what its purpose is.

The amendment No. 2, proposed by the Senate and agreed to by the conferees, composed of Members of the House and Senate, reads:

And that it can substantially effect the purposes set out in section 1 of this resolution.

As no purpose of the invention is set out in section 1, this amendment absolutely means nothing and is, as a matter of fact, nonsensical. It is a kind and character of legislation which this Congress should not disgrace the statutes with. We are under no obligation to enact a resolution of this kind in a few minutes which will go out to the world and remain upon the statute books for all time where part of the wording is absolutely without meaning. I hope that this invention, which the inventor, Mr. Giragossian, has told me personally is a new kind of an engine for concentrating and storing a cosmic energy which has not been harnessed up for use by anyone up to the present time, and for using this energy as a motive power in much the same way that steam and electricity are used, will be a success. I have talked to the gentleman, and I may say I have a great deal of faith in his claims of a new discovery in science, and of an invention of wonderful value and importance to mankind. While I fully favor the passage of this bill, I contend, as one who has a decent respect for the intelligence and carefulness of this great legislative body, that the bill when it is passed and enacted into law should be in such form and wording that when it is carefully read by even the ordinary layman it will not bring ridicule upon Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CHURCH], and after Mr. CHURCH has finished I am going to move the previous question. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from California starts I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio, the last speech having been in his favor, whether he intends to close all discussion?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has just announced that when the gentleman from California concludes he is going to move the previous question.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I have been keenly interested in the claims made for Mr. Giragossian's free-energy generator, and I therefore introduced House joint resolution 116, which was passed by the Congress at the last session. I also introduced the present resolution 174.

In doing so, I was profoundly convinced that I was performing a most valuable service to my country and mankind as well, if one fraction of Mr. Giragossian's claims should be practical. I do not know anything about his discovery, but I believe he will verify all that he claims.

During the recent consideration by the Congress of resolution 116 the gentleman from Ohio questioned the gentleman from Wisconsin in the following words, as we read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

If this man has an invention for the free and unlimited coinage of energy, does not the gentleman believe we would be justified in passing this bill?

The gentleman from Wisconsin answered in the negative.

Such a negative attitude plainly indicates that there is a certain class of people who will, under any circumstances, oppose the passage of this resolution. They will try in some way to mutilate the resolution so that it may not be acceptable to one of the two parties, namely, the Government and the inventor. They know plainly that this resolution is a contract, and is and should be drawn by mutual agreement between the two parties and that any omission from or addition to the resolution will nullify it. That is their aim—that is to say, to deprive our Government and people of the benefit of this great discovery. If we should all be of the same mind as the opponents of this resolution, the possible loss to our country would be beyond conception.

This man offers the Government the free use of his work, which will mean a saving to it of hundreds of millions of dollars yearly. Furthermore, the Government will most probably buy the exclusive right to the invention, and we can then sell the right of utilization to foreign countries and thereby get more than we would pay him and thus be able to give the free use of the discovery to our people.

Or the Government could raise an ample revenue through a system of royalties—a revenue which would be calculated by hundreds of millions of dollars yearly. For example, there are probably 7,000,000 farmers in this country who, on an average, would each utilize 150 horsepower for various purposes. The total would amount to upward of 1,000,000,000 horsepower, resulting in such incalculable benefit to every branch of farming industry in our country that such energy would be used

lavishly. Ten million horses of the 20,000,000 in this country may be rendered useless on account of the Garabed. Then we will have, for other uses, 50,000,000 acres of tilled land, as it is necessary to cultivate about five acres in order to feed one horse.

It will be unnecessary and tedious to go into details of all the benefits that free energy can bring. A very slight consideration of its possibilities will stagger the imagination of the most powerful mind.

Is there any sensible and righteous reason to disregard and not to give due consideration to such a work? What is this man asking in return for his magnificent offer? He is asking, as his compensation, protection for his rights only—simply a patent that shall be in conformity with the spirit and letter of our Constitution. I do believe he has just cause to ask it.

In the case of our refusal, with the resultant loss of this great discovery, what are the opponents of the resolution going to give instead to our country and mankind? Nothing.

In my opinion we should give the greatest incentive and encouragement to our inventive geniuses. They should know that we will afford every possible consideration and protection to any great epoch-making invention or discovery.

It is regrettable that, whether we like it or not, we are in the war. I am positively convinced we will be victorious, but it is our duty to make this ruinous and bloody conflict as short as possible. We should utilize every available instrument or invention that American toil or ingenuity can produce so as to lessen the horror of this war. If the Garabed can shorten this great struggle only one day, it is worth while to give every possible consideration to the matter, and pass this resolution, and pass it by unanimous vote. There are various and strong reasons for believing that this invention will play, in an unbelievably brief time, the greatest rôle in shortening this war.

Mr. Speaker, this inventor claims to have discovered the key that unlocks an unlimited ocean of energy. He says there is energy enough there to propel all of the flying machines in existence; enough to drive all the men-of-war, merchant ships, and other ocean crafts; enough to run all railroad trains, combined harvesters, traction engines, and thrashing machines; enough to draw every harrow, cultivator, and plow; enough energy to run all nitrate plants and cause them to toil ceaselessly at the will of man; enough to run all pumping plants and to draw, from unknown depths, water enough to irrigate every acre of land on earth; enough energy to make the deserts blossom as the rose, and to pump inland lakes on bad and barren lands; enough to turn all of the wheels of industry of the world; enough to lift every hammer and turn every drill; enough to run every sewing machine, washing machine, and churn; and enough to supply a little power plant in every home.

One of the strange things about these monstrous claims is, the inventor has the power to convince nearly everyone with whom he comes in contact that there is about a 50 per cent chance that he has exactly what he pretends to have. It is true there are some self-centered men who reject every new claim, however promising, unless it comes through themselves or some other favored source.

Naturally a person making such far-reaching assertions as does the party in this case, must undergo a test as to his intelligence and sincerity. Mr. Giragossian has made my office his headquarters for the last four or five months and I have had many opportunities to observe him. He is a man of rare intelligence and great sincerity of purpose. He is a deep thinker and one of the most remarkable philosophers I have ever met, and I say to you frankly, he has convinced me almost beyond the question of a doubt that he has exactly what he claims. In making this statement I am reminded of the fact that if he is correct he will become the great benefactor of the human race.

I submit to you, gentlemen, that his requests, as set forth in this resolution, are reasonable; that if he is mistaken in his claims the Government loses nothing, but if he is correct his invention will bring us untold wealth. He is not asking for an appropriation with which to develop some untried feature of his claims; he has worked it all out through years of toil by the use of his own money, time, energy, and skill. He simply asks for protection, provided he makes good, and requests that five eminent scientists be chosen who shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior; that he shall be commissioned to make known to them his secret; to show them the working-sized engine which he has made and now has in his possession; that when this is done, if they say, "Giragossian, you have proven your claims," then the Government will protect him for the period of 17 years against patent sharks and infringers. In turn for this protection he is to give to the Government the use of his invention free of charge, to be used as the Government sees fit on all

its flying ships, ocean ships, and wherever it is desirable to use it, either on land or sea. If he has what he claims, the Government will save each year hundreds of millions of dollars in the price of gasoline, coal, and other fuel. If he does not make good, the Government does not lose a cent as it assumes no financial obligation in reference to the proposition.

If this man has not what he claims, will any man here tell me why he is here in Washington spending his time, energy, and money? Does he want this resolution to pass and this committee appointed simply to provide him an opportunity to make a failure and thus disgrace himself in the eyes of his fellow-men?

Gentlemen, I submit that if this man has what he claims we need its benefits now more than any other moment in all the history of the world because it will, in a very marked degree, assist us in ending this heartless war. We need this engine on a thousand ships that we are now constructing; we need it on our almost countless airships that are now being made. If this invention is what it is claimed to be, from the green hills of Virginia fleets and flocks of flying machines can arise, defy, and cross the ocean and hover indefinitely above the entrenched enemy and rain explosives upon them until, in despair and fright, they stack their guns and quit.

Gentlemen, I submit on the part of wisdom it is well for us to give this man an opportunity to make his demonstration at the earliest possible moment for if he fails we lose nothing, but if he makes good his discovery means an epoch in the human race so far-reaching that no one can foretell its good result. It will shorten the hours of toil for every laboring man, it will increase the pleasures of life tenfold, it will make the deserts of this old world blossom as the rose, and as the first great unspeakable blessing it will end this heartless, cruel war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves the previous question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman can not brow-beat the House that way—

The SPEAKER. It is not debatable. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order there is no quorum present. He has a perfect right to make it, and the gentleman had a perfect right to move the previous question. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A hundred and forty-one gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kansas rise?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Is not there an automatic call of the House? Is not the question on the previous question?

The SPEAKER. There is no automatic call about it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Was not the question stated?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman raised the point of order that there was no quorum present before the Chair even asked anybody to vote. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] moves a call of the House.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. CRISP) there were—ayes 97, noes 2.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will lock the door, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Davis	Greene, Vt.	McKeown
Bowers	Dent	Hamill	McLaughlin, Pa.
Brodbeck	Dooling	Hamilton, N. Y.	McLemore
Brumbaugh	Doremus	Haskell	Mahei
Caldwell	Drukker	Heintz	Mann
Campbell, Pa.	Eagle	Helvering	Martin
Cannon	Elston	Hollingsworth	Meeker
Capstick	Estopinal	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Ind.
Caraway	Fairchild, B. L.	Husted	Morin
Carew	Fairchild, G. W.	Johnson, S. D.	Mott
Chandler, N. Y.	Ferris	Kahu	Nelson
Clark, Fla.	Flynn	LaGuardia	Nicholls, S. C.
Clark, Pa.	Focht	Lobeck	O'Shaunessy
Costello	Frear	Loneragan	Parker, N. J.
Cramton	Goodwin, Ariz.	McClintic	Parker, N. Y.
Curry, Cal.	Gordon	McCulloch	Peters
Davidson	Graham, Pa.	McKenzie	Rayburn

Rowland	Sterling, Pa.	Tillman	Wilson, La.
Sabath	Sullivan	Treadway	Wingo
Scott, Pa.	Swift	Van Dyke	Winslow
Scully	Talbott	Vare	Wise
Sherley	Taylor, Colo.	Ward	
Smith, T. F.	Templeton	Watson, Va.	

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The question is on agreeing to the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CROSSLER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. McLEMORE, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for three days, on account of illness in his family.

AGRICULTURE.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9054.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9054, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, States Relations Service: To carry into effect the provisions of an act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act to establish agricultural experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto," the sums apportioned to the several States and Territories, to be paid quarterly in advance, \$720,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

My purpose in taking the floor at this time is to call the attention of the House to the serious condition that confronts the farmers of the country with respect to farm labor. Much is said by the Food Administrator and in the press throughout the country about the necessity for conserving food and economizing in its use. Conservation of food products and economy in the household will serve a great purpose, but the essential thing, a matter of the very greatest importance to the people of this country and to our allies, is the production of food in America in the coming year. This can not be done without farm labor. How is it to be secured? Service with the colors is taking men from the farms in every school district throughout the farming sections of the United States. Men who can not be spared from the farms are taken where they are essential with the colors. Something must be done to supply this labor, and I wish to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the matter. How can it be done? We are appropriating in this bill something like \$27,000,000. Properly utilized it would serve a good purpose, but it will not produce a crop in 1918 that will be available in a year from now to feed America and to aid in feeding our allies in Europe.

This is a serious thing to the farmers of the country, and even more serious to the people of the country who are not farmers, but must have food. I think we should make provision in this bill for labor to replace the farm labor that has been taken into the war from the farms. I make this suggestion: There are boys ranging from 15 to 21 years of age in every city and town in the country who are attending school. They ought to go to school, of course, but I believe that in this coming vacation these boys could acquire a knowledge and experience on farms as farm laborers that would be of value to them throughout their lives, and by enlisting for farm labor or taking employment upon the farms of the country and aiding in the production of crops they would render a great service at this time. They would be especially valuable in producing corn, in harvesting wheat and oats, in planting and taking care of and digging potatoes and all root crops. They would be especially valuable in producing sugar beets in the sugar-beet sections of

the country. And without their labor, without some such labor as that, there will be a shortage of every crop that is essential and for which we have so much need. What we need above everything is production sufficient for all our needs. The farmers will have enough to eat, and have less cause for worry about the shortage of farm labor than those who do not live upon the farms.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I am in thorough sympathy with what the gentleman says about the shortage of farm labor and the disastrous effects of it. Would it not be a good idea to make the Government clerks work eight hours a day and stop bringing so much farm labor here to the Capital?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will tell the gentleman from Missouri what I think would be a better idea than that, and that would be to send one-third of the clerks home and let the other two-thirds do all the work, whether it takes them 8 hours or 10 hours. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. May I suggest that Carpenters' Union No. 61, of Kansas City, has sent me a resolution offering to send all its members, 1,400, into the harvest field next summer if needed?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is a good suggestion. I think that the young men from 15 to 21 years old might well take employment on the farms of the country, beginning on the 1st of April and ending, say, the middle of November, and get a certificate of service to their country as having done their bit at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do not believe that the gentleman from South Carolina is sufficiently impressed with the importance of farm labor in food-crop production. We are providing here \$27,000,000 for a lot of clerks in these departments and for a lot of scientists who will not produce an ounce of anything to eat in 1918 unless there is farm labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Kansas has made a very wise statement. I hope we can take it into consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that we ought to have much more labor on the farm, but I think it is imaginary and impossible to get these fellows out of the cities. They have not any sense about farming to start with, and you can not get those young fellows out from under the electric lights in the cities.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman may be correct to a certain extent, but I believe that if these young men are appealed to from a patriotic standpoint, and their parents are appealed to, they will perform this important labor on the farm.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. COX. I know the gentleman is thoroughly conversant with the situation in Kansas, as I am to the situation in Indiana. Why would not this be a solution of the problem—to require young men from the age of 15 to 19, possibly 20, to be actually enrolled, so that the President could send them to the farms in the country to help the farmers out? They are not worth a rap if you send them out from school. You could beg them until you were black in the face, and you could not get them to work. You must have power behind you.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am asking the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to take an interest in this subject and to do something at an early date that will provide farm labor. I know, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] knows, that many farmers will let lay fallow much of their farm land in the coming year for want of farm labor.

Mr. COX. They are doing it now in the State of Indiana. They are sowing their fields in grass.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They will have to do the same thing in Kansas and in every part of the country, because they can not get the labor to cultivate the land if something practical is not done to meet the situation.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Would it not be a good suggestion that we take this advice to ourselves and speed up our own work, and then the young men of this House can go home and do some farming work during the summer? [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am anxious to do that. I will say further to the gentleman from Nebraska that I am getting ready to put in a little crop this spring myself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I may say that while I was in the West recently I learned that in Beaverhead, Mont., the schools in the county seat, Dillon, and elsewhere in the county had agreed to run six days a week. That is, they agreed to have school on Saturday, so that the boys might work later on the farms last fall and start earlier in the spring. That is the only place where I found that idea adopted.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I feel sure that if it is brought properly to the attention of the young men of the country and their parents farm laborers could be secured in very large numbers to raise a crop in the coming season.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to say that I had a delegation before me this morning from the fertilizer people, claiming that they can not get cars to ship fertilizer or coal to manufacture it. Is not that an important proposition?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; that is important. The reason why they can not get cars is that the railroads in recent years have not been keeping up their equipment, and the reason fertilizer may be short of the requirements is because of labor conditions. The productive labor of the country is short. And there are many young men in school who will remain in school until the middle of June or the 1st of July who might well spare two months or two months and a half out of school in the spring and the same time in the fall, and put the time in planting a crop and remaining upon the farm until the crop is gathered in November.

Mr. QUIN. Where are these schoolboys coming from?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. From the cities and towns.

Mr. QUIN. O, my God, do not you know they can not farm? [Laughter.] It will take a year to teach one of them.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They can learn. They are generally pretty husky fellows, most of them. They stand work in trenches; they stand the hard work in the Army.

Mr. QUIN. They can not plow. They can not dig.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. There is much work they can do. They can do a great deal of work on the farm. We have provided in this bill for many instructors in farm labor. What do they do? Why, they do very little for the average farmer who knows his business. They come around and occasionally say something to a farmer that is a good suggestion. But they could materially aid in getting these boys to come from the schools into the work on the farm and help them get started in farm labor. Something of this kind must be done. Labor must be provided for the farms or we will not have food enough for all our needs in the coming year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. SNYDER. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have made this suggestion because I think it is important. Much of the money appropriated by this bill will avail nothing unless there is farm labor.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Kansas be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I do not claim to be a farmer, but I do come from a great agricultural district, that is also as well a great manufacturing district. There is great disturbance in the minds of the farmers of our part of the country at the present time, because they fear they are not going to get sufficient help to put in their crops this year and that they will not be able to get their crops off the fields if they do put them in, having gone through that experience last year, very much to their disadvantage.

I believe the farmers in my district are patriotic, as they are all over this country. They have worked hard and long hours, and are willing to continue to do that, but they believe that something definite should be done for them now before the time for putting in crops is past. With that in view, I understand that a measure has already been considered by the Military Affairs Committee, that gives the Secretary of War the right to furlough men back into various industries, and it is my understanding that it is the purport of that bill to take care to some extent of this particular thing that we are discussing here this morning. I myself early in the session introduced a bill to exempt farmers and farmer boys and other men under similar conditions. My measure would simply cover farms of from 50 to 100 acres. In my part of the country we have more farms of that size than larger ones. These men are terribly handicapped, and made great losses last year by not being able to harvest their crops. While they are patriotic, you can hardly expect a farmer to put in more stuff than he believes he can get out. That is what we are laboring under to-day. I certainly hope that whether some action is taken in this bill or not something will be done between now and the 1st day of March to assure the farmers of this country that they are going to have some definite assistance and an understanding with reference to getting off the crops that they put in.

Now, if I have just a minute, I should like to say a word or two about boys and girls going on the farms. In the State of New York last year we adopted that policy, and we already have a law up there for universal military training, and last year we sent thousands of boys from school and thousands of girls onto the farms, and they did good work, and many farmers certified to the benefit that they got from these boys out of the schools last year. That work will be multiplied tenfold this year.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Was that compulsory service?

Mr. SNYDER. No; it is not compulsory, but it is carried on by a system of enrollment, as the gentleman from Indiana has suggested, and the school-teachers and school superintendents throughout the State took charge of that work, listing up the boys and placing them and the girls on the farms. I want to say just this in response to my friend from the South, Mr. QUIN, that up in our country we do have in the towns and cities boys who can work on the farms; and many farmers who have got a little on the better side of farming, who have made some money, have moved into the towns. Their children have had eight or nine years on the farm, as I had when I was a boy, and they do not forget all they learned about farming. When summer comes they are only too glad to go back on the farm and give somebody the benefit of their assistance.

Mr. FESS. Had these boys who were sent out from the schools had any training on farms before?

Mr. SNYDER. Some of them had and some of them had not, and the same thing might be said about the girls who went onto the farms.

Mr. FESS. At Dayton, Ohio, there were several boys sent from the city out to the farms, but they were not adapted to the work, and the men who employed them said they could not endure them, that they did not know how to handle horses, and they really were of more loss to them than they were advantage.

Mr. SNYDER. Up in our section we did not have that condition. Many times when I was going through the country last summer I saw boys running hay rakes, running mowing machines, loading hay, on the top of the hay, and I have been in barns where they were mowing it back, and the farmers told me they were getting a good deal of help in that way. They simply had to have this help. There was no other way they could get it.

Mr. FESS. They must have exercised some discretion in their selection, did they not?

Mr. SNYDER. Very likely they did. The farmers had the right to say whether they would take a boy 15 years old or a boy 10 years old. I have seen 10-year-old boys working on the farm.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. IGOE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Young, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 174) for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, for lessening the expenses of the war, and restoring the loss caused by the war by providing for the employment of a discovery or invention called the "Garabed," claiming to make possible the utilization of free energy.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, all this discussion is aside from this paragraph. This paragraph has to do with the appropriations for the Hatch Act. I must insist that we confine ourselves to the proper discussion of the item under consideration.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I hope the gentleman will give me five minutes along this line.

Mr. LEVER. We are expected to get this bill through this afternoon; and if every gentleman takes the floor for five minutes, we might as well close up shop, because we can not pass it to-day. Several Members around me have asked me to give them a little time, failing to realize that the Committee on Agriculture is a very busy committee. Gentlemen come in here once a day and make speeches. We have to sit here all day, and, in addition to that, we have things ahead of us that we ought to be doing. I trust gentlemen will not press this discussion, which is not germane at this point. There is a place in the bill where it will be germane, and I will be very glad to be liberal when we reach that point. It is absolutely out of place here.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It does not encourage us very much to stay here when you will not let us say anything when we do come.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] to have five and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] to have five.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] each to have five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say, in reference to what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] has said about the boys from the city being unwilling and unable to do farm work, the district wherein I live and represent is a large city district and I farm in a country district. I know that many city boys went from Baltimore into the country and did splendid work. The work that they do depends very much on the farmer who employs them. If the farmer who employs them puts them down to hard work at the beginning, without training, it is impossible for them to do good work. He must give them a little chance to get down to hard work and teach them the work at hand as they proceed. If he does this and takes an interest in them, they will surely give him great satisfaction.

I know of a young man farming next to me who had a number of young men under contract from the Johns Hopkins University, of Baltimore—city boys. I have seen those boys in his fields from early morning until sundown, doing work and doing good work. They not only did good work, but they were fine associates as well. I know there are plenty of boys in the city of Baltimore and other large cities who can and want to go and do farm work if they can get the chance. They must be taught and trained and they will be found intelligent, hard workers.

Now, I want to say a word about the fertilizer question. I had a delegation of fertilizer men before me this morning from my district, who say that it is absolutely necessary if we want big crops this year to get the fertilizer to the farmer. So far they say it has been next to impossible for the manufacturers to get fuel to run the plants, and some can not get it. Then it is absolutely impossible to get enough cars to send the fertilizer to the sections where it will soon be needed. They suggest that cars ought to be furnished for those sections where planting will soon be in operation, and then other cars for sections farther north. In this way, they tell me, the fertilizer can be supplied gradually from South to North without any great drain on the railroads.

The question of fertilizer is a serious one. If you can not get as much farm labor as desired, we will have to do more intensive farming. If we have to pay \$12 a bushel for peas instead of \$6 a bushel, we will have to put more fertilizer back of them to produce a crop proportioned to the cost of the seed and labor. We know that it takes just as much labor to work over a field producing 50 bushels per bushel planted as it does to work over a field well fertilized which produces 100 bushels. It does not take any more labor to produce 100 bushels with intensified farming than to produce 50 bushels on a poorly fertilized farm. I merely state this so that Members interested in this matter who want to see a big crop and the people well fed may get after the fertilizer and see that it is manufactured and gets to their farms. I believe if you do that and get the

boys from the city you will produce all the crops that you need this year.

I am not a novice as to farming and farm work. I was raised on a farm and taught by a father who was a progressive farmer. He knew above all things that unless you fertilized and otherwise improved your land, you were not a farmer but a miner, taking all from the land and putting nothing back. He also knew the value of farm machinery and put this knowledge into practice. He realized that with proper farm machinery half the force on a farm could do the work, and do it with less labor. Many farmers are terribly handicapped in the early spring, when planting season arrives, by not being ready to take advantage of the weather at once. If the farmer will have his machinery, plows, and so forth, all placed in readiness for springtime and planting, he will be saved much worry and time.

I would not be adverse to helping farmers buy machinery. It saves so much labor and enables one to produce in greater abundance. You men from the farming sections impress upon your people the necessity of intensive, up-to-date farming. The farmers are awake, I am sure, but we all like a little boosting at times. It is the little fellow, the timid farmer, the one who fears debt as he fears fire—these are the men who need encouragement.

It has been said that the farmer must win the war, that it is a question of food endurance. Plenty of fertilizer and other land improvement, proper farm machinery, intensive farming, aided by the farmer boy and the trained city boy will save the day, I am sure.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would be glad to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Does not the gentleman think that one boy raised on a farm and actively employed is worth more than two city boys?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Of course he is worth more.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Why should not the Government in the administration of the law with reference to the selective draft exhibit a little more liberal spirit and leave the boys on the farm?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have given the gentleman's question a good deal of thought. It has occurred to me that boys taken from the farm under the new draft ought to be furloughed to produce a crop, and when the crop is produced we can consider whether they shall go back or whether we need them worse on the farm. It is a very serious question.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. GARNER, having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 9054, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

INCOME-TAX PRIMER.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House concurrent resolution 33, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 33.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there shall be printed 500,000 extra copies of the Income-Tax Primer, prepared by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the information and assistance of taxpayers, 150,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 350,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, the same to be distributed through the folding room.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

AGRICULTURE.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the importance of the matter which has been the subject of discussion before the committee is fully understood. It has been treated largely as if it was a matter of worry on the part of the farmers. As a matter of fact, the country at large needs to worry over the subject more than the farmers. The farmers are going to have enough to eat, as far as they are concerned. There is some question whether this country will have enough

to eat, and a still more serious question whether our allies will have enough to eat. What action ought the House to take at this time? It can take no action on this bill, but it ought to be considering measures which may be adopted to relieve the situation, and one of the first is that which has already been spoken of. I entirely concur with the suggestion that a bill ought to be passed to furlough soldiers now in these camps in time to help raise the spring crops, where crops are dependent on their labor. There has been a singular strictness, if I may so term it, in reference to exemption rules. I can not understand where a man is running a 160-acre farm, producing, as we do in Iowa on our productive soil, crops of immense value to the country, with no one to help him, no way to obtain labor, why these young men should not be exempt, and I know of hundreds of cases where they are not exempt. I do not know how the crops in my State are going to be planted this spring if no provision is made for help at that critical time. Spring work on the farm can not be postponed. It can not wait. It must be done at the right time or the crop will be a failure. Moreover, as a rule, the spring work must be done by a skilled workman. The preparing of the soil and planting of the crops must be done by one who not only knows how to handle horses but also complicated machinery. He must know, too, just when each part should be done and the proper manner of doing it.

So that I say some action ought to be taken with a view of furloughing soldiers in such cases, in order that these crops may be gotten in in the spring. Then there is another matter, which, while it is not a matter for the consideration of this committee, is a matter for consideration of my own community, if I could make my voice heard that far, and for a good portion of the West. In every community out that way there is a large number of farmers who are retired. They are men who have had experience in farming, but who, of course, are no longer able to do the heavy physical work. They are able, however, to sit on a riding plow or a riding cultivator. They know how to handle horses. They know how the work ought to be done and how to give directions to persons ignorant of the work, and I hope that their patriotic impulses will be stirred so that every one of them will be out on the farm doing what he can in order to get these crops in and produce the food so necessary for the country at this time. Every State should do something in the line of what has been done in the State of New York. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] told you something with reference to what is being done there, but his remarks were not, I think, entirely complete. As I understand it, the State of New York has opened a school for the training of boys and girls—boys not old enough to go into the Army and girls of the age from 18 to 25 who are willing to work on the farm. These boys and girls are given preliminary training, and something of that kind ought to be done in every State. I understand this work has been very successful and large numbers of boys and girls have been gotten out to do the work on the farm, and they have given considerable help. Am I correct in that?

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman is correct, and if the gentleman will permit, I would state that the greatest number has come from around the suburbs of New York, the largest city we have.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is another little trouble with the farmers themselves. They take these boys that come out from the city and then have no patience with them. As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUINN] said, they do not know how to handle horses, they do not know anything about farm work. All they have is the spirit of willingness and the desire to do something, which they do not understand. Unless our farmers themselves are going to exercise some patience in this matter the results of trying to get these boys and girls out on the farms will entirely fail. It is a time when the patriotic impulses of every person—retired farmers, boys who are in the ranks, boys and girls who are in the towns not fully employed but who might be on the farm—ought to be exercised, and I commend these questions to the House for its careful consideration, for I believe that nothing can be of more importance at this time. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For farmers' cooperative demonstration work outside of the cotton belt, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, \$554,800.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What I am going to say should probably have been said at an earlier portion of the bill, when the seed item was under consideration, but I want to say this, that owing to weather conditions the last season, so far as the corn crop throughout the Middle West—Illinois, Iowa, and other States—was concerned, the corn was not matured as it ordinarily is. I have had considerable correspondence from citizens in Illinois refer-

ence to seed corn for the coming year. It is a very serious question with the corn-growing States. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if the Agricultural Department is taking any steps looking to the proper distribution—not free—of seed corn, so that farmers may be able to secure it in those sections of the country where corn is an important crop.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the food-production bill which we passed last year carried an appropriation of two and a half million dollars for furnishing field seed in emergencies such as the gentleman describes. There is pending before the Committee on Appropriations, I understand, a deficiency item of \$6,000,000 to further supplement the funds the department now has. I am not sure that the department will recommend any additional funds for this purpose in its emergency bill which it will present to the committee later in the season. The department is purchasing seed of all descriptions to distribute to farmers for cash at cost in those localities where the seed situation is critical.

Mr. FOSTER. They are asking enormous prices for seed corn, so much so that it seems to me that it does seriously affect the corn crop for the coming year. I do not know how it is all over the West, but I know that in some portions of Illinois there is a great deal of corn, probably a majority of it, that is unfit for seed purposes this year, and that something must be done in order to secure corn from localities where the corn is suitable for planting.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I do not know what the situation in regard to seed corn is, but I have recently had information that in the sorghum seed market there were indications of a corner. Does the gentleman have information or indications of a monopoly or corner in seeds for agricultural purposes at the present time?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not. The only thing I have is a letter in which they say they are asked to pay as high as \$6 a bushel for ordinary seed corn.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Right in that connection I would like to state that at a public farm sale in my district a few days ago a farmer paid \$32 for a bushel of seed corn.

Mr. FOSTER. That might be an exceptional case, but that is not generally the price.

Mr. McKENZIE. Of course, that was up in my district, and not down in the gentleman's district.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, they may have money to throw away up in the gentleman's district, but I doubt if they are well enough posted in that district to know really what they ought to pay. [Laughter.] In my district the farmers are too smart to be gulled into paying \$32 a bushel for ordinary seed corn.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will simply say, in my district they usually know a good thing when they see it.

Mr. FOSTER. They certainly do in their Representative, but in the purchase of seed corn I do not think they have been very wise.

Mr. BOOHER. I would like to say to the gentleman that I read a statement in one of the county papers published in my district that a certain farmer has put up 400 bushels of corn, selected corn, for seed, and was offering it to his neighbors for \$2.50 a bushel.

Mr. FOSTER. That is probably not an excessive price this year.

Mr. BOOHER. That is cheap for a man to separate his corn and sell it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to say in my judgment this is an important matter for consideration, and if the Agricultural Department is looking out for seeds to be planted for spring it is important to get the right kind of corn for planting. Everybody who lives in a corn country knows that corn must be matured to preserve it so as to grow in the spring, and I hope that the Department of Agriculture will, in their supply of seeds to sell to farmers for cash, not overlook this fact, and I take it they will not because the corn crop in the Middle West is an immense crop and needs proper care taken to see that the seed will be supplied when the time comes.

The Clerk read as follows:

For farmers' cooperative demonstrations and for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington

and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, \$650,140: *Provided*, That the expense of such service shall be defrayed from this appropriation and such cooperative funds as may be voluntarily contributed by State, county, and municipal agencies, associations of farmers, and individual farmers, universities, colleges, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, other local associations of business men, business organizations, and individuals within the State.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, the observations which I have to make will relate to the paragraph just before the one last read, although this refers to the same class of work. I did not want the reading of this paragraph to pass without taking the opportunity to express an appreciation of the splendid work of the county agricultural agents. In the country in which I live, a mixed farm and stock-growing country, more particularly a stock-growing country, our people were a little slow to realize the importance and the value of the work that might be done by the county agent, and it required some years and some considerable agitation to bring our people, particularly where the counties were rather limited as to funds with which to cooperate, to a point where they were willing to accept the responsibility and the cost of this cooperation. But in every case so far as I know in my State, where the county agent has been employed it is the well-nigh universal testimony that the aid rendered and the work performed by the county agent has been of very great value. It is a real pleasure, in view of the character of some Federal appointees, in view of the lack of real valuable work performed by some who get on the Federal pay roll, to find a certain class and individuals of a class of appointees who are really adapted to and prepared for their work and who do enter upon it with enthusiasm and intelligence; with an appreciation of the people among whom they labor, the problems they are called upon to solve, and of the proper diplomatic effort by which and through which they can make themselves really useful and effective, on behalf of the people they serve. The agents in my State have not, so far as I have come in contact with them, been taking on airs of superior knowledge, as some have feared they would, or minimized the value of their work by failing to come into hearty sympathy and cooperation with the men among whom they work. I have observed that they have endeavored to learn the best practices of the section and of the region as practically demonstrated, and to bring the general practice up to the best practice, and aiding in the accomplishment of that end by their scientific and practical knowledge and information. They have performed a great work. So far as I know, in my State they are men of the right stamp, kind, and character. If the character of the men, and of their work everywhere, is as it is in my section, a splendid work, highly beneficial to agriculture in its broadest sense, is being performed by these men. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, the matter of labor—

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will pardon me a moment. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will not the gentleman waive that? I desire to have about seven or eight minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen say, "let it run along," but the chairman of the committee is a busy man, and so are all the members of his committee, and I would like to get through with this bill this afternoon and we are not going to do it unless gentlemen limit their time. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan desires five minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Mississippi will take three.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will not the gentleman raise that a little?

Mr. BARNHART. I would like two minutes.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Indiana wants two minutes. I will make it 15 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not expect to speak much more on this bill and I would like to have seven or eight minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I will make it 15 minutes, the gentleman to have seven.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to say something that I think the committee ought to know.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, everyone, whether from a farm or an industrial center, will agree that there ought to be ample labor for farm production. I was impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr.

CAMPBELL] on that subject this morning and thoroughly agree with him that some arrangement should be made by which we can get more labor on the farm, because we need farm products, and we will continue to need them in larger degree than heretofore. But there are other things besides labor needed on the farm—fertilizer, for instance, which every Member of this House who has a farming constituency will understand. As to this phase of the question I was informed this morning that two large establishments manufacturing fertilizer, one at Baltimore and the other at Philadelphia, may be compelled to close within a very few days, throwing eight hundred or a thousand hands out of work and depriving the farmer of this essential commodity, for the want of coal to continue operations.

The other day, in making a few remarks with regard to the distribution of coal and the desirability of having some other port of exit and entry besides the port of New York to which we might ship our supplies and more equitably and speedily distribute the products of the country, including coal, I made reference to the fact that certain coal barges, then laden, were standing idle in the Delaware River because the propelling power for those barges had been taken away for war purposes. I referred to the fact that the Menhaden fishery boats had not been taken and were still plying their trade, capturing fish in the open sea and turning them in for oil.

I did not go so far as to say that they were grinding them up for fertilizer, but that is also true, and, of course, is of interest to the farmer. Since making that talk the Navy Department advises me that they had not taken the menhaden fishing boats—and there are certainly a hundred or so around the Delaware and Chesapeake Bays capable of doing sea service—because the Food Administrator had requested that those boats be let alone.

Now, the people want food fish and the Food Administrator is supposed to help the people get food fish, but the issuance of an order or request equivalent thereto by the Food Administrator indicating that the continuance of the menhaden fisheries as heretofore conducted would increase the food supply is, to those who know the situation, next to absurd. These menhaden fisheries are after oil and the residuum that goes into fertilizer. The food fish they get, as a rule, are ground up and the public obtains no food advantage therefrom. If it be claimed they produce fertilizer which facilitates the food supply we are now confronted with the fuel shortage, which threatens even the fertilizer.

It seems to me there is a hitch somewhere, due possibly to the overlapping of these myriads of new officials and clerks in Washington, to whom the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] referred. We seem not to be getting the best results as to food and fuel—certainly not at the present time.

The farmer and the industrialist are interdependent, as I have contended a hundred times upon this floor. If the industries can not get their coal the farmer may not get his fertilizer.

Close up these two establishments, one in Baltimore and the other in Philadelphia, and I warrant you that the farmer of Maine, who is a very important factor in the cultivation of the potato, even to the extent of sending his spuds down to Florida for early crops, will be unable to render the best service. Close up these industries for want of coal, and these establishments in Philadelphia and Baltimore may not be able to serve the States of Maryland or of Virginia. The difficulties confronting these two industrial plants affect New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, in addition to the others I have mentioned. No one can tell how far these influences extend.

I do not know how it is with the more southern fertilizer establishments. They have them—very large ones—down at Richmond, over at Charleston, at Savannah, and at Jacksonville, and I assume they are subject to the same conditions with regard to fuel that other fertilizer establishments are.

I understand this matter has been brought to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture and that he has evinced some interest in it. I have brought it to the attention of the Fuel Administrator, but I want Congress to know how vital this matter of the holding up of the coal supply is to all the essential factors in production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] speak so favorably of the work being done in his State under this and similar appropriations, because this is an appropriation supplementing the appropriations now being made under what is known as the Lever law, a law for which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] deserves the whole credit, not-

withstanding the fact that a distinguished gentleman in another body is claiming credit for it and in some way has been able to have his name attached to the law.

I feel that this work would be as successful in other parts of the country, in the entire country, as in Wyoming if it were carried on in all places as it has been there. And it can very easily be carried on in that very proper way. If it is not, the fault lies with the State and largely with the local community because of the plan of selection of the county agent. The Department of Agriculture cooperates with the agricultural college in this matter. The State agent is selected as the joint appointee of the Department of Agriculture and the State agricultural college. No appointment of county agent is made without the approval of the State agent. He knows the men, their names and residences, who are suited for the work, and when a county makes appropriation and provides money to put itself in line to take up this work the State agent suggests the names of men suitable for the work and who are open to employment. The men are sent, one by one, if required, to the county to undergo examination by those who are locally interested, usually a farm bureau composed of local farmers. In the first place, the State agent does not suggest the employment of any man who is not known or thought to be suitable for the work and the local people are not required to accept any man or to let their money go to pay him, even in part, unless after this investigation they are satisfied he understands their problems and is so well informed and is such character of man as to be suitable for work in the county.

If this plan of selecting county agents were known to those who have so bitterly opposed this item, I think objection would be overcome. They would see that the fault, if fault there be, lies with them or with the people of their locality and that the difficulty can be overcome.

I think this is very important work. Its value has been shown all over this country where it has been carried out properly. It can be made good work everywhere. The local authorities should pay attention to the manner in which these men are secured. No man is forced upon them. Their money goes to pay no man who is not acceptable to them, and if at any time the work of a county agent is not satisfactory communication with the State agent will result in his removal and the appointment of a capable man satisfactory to local interests.

I am glad, as I say, to hear the words of approval by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and I believe that others who know this work and have seen enough of it to appreciate what it is will vouch for the value of it and from time to time approve the appropriations recommended by the Committee on Agriculture to carry it on.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report upon the organization and progress of farmers' institutes and agricultural schools in the several States and Territories, and upon similar organizations in foreign countries, with special suggestions of plans and methods for making such organizations more effective for the dissemination of the results of the work of the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural experiment stations, and of improved methods of agricultural practice, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, \$20,600.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman make that seven minutes? I think it will take me about that length of time to say what I desire, and then he had better reserve for himself about three minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I infer from that that the gentleman is about to make an attack on this item. I ask that the debate close in 10 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, this item authorizes the Secretary to investigate and report upon the organization and progress of farmers' institutes and agricultural schools in the several States and Territories. The item is a good one. The investigation proposed, I have no doubt, is carried out in a way to be helpful. The institutions to be investigated and encouraged do a great deal of good. But if we are to have organizations of farmers' institutes and agricultural schools we must have farmers; and if the farmers, and particularly the best

farmers—the young and virile, the vigorous and the successful farmers—are all to be drawn from the communities, there will not be a great many left to aid in the active work of these valuable institutes and schools.

Those who approved and urged the conscript law, the draft law, to which we are all loyal, now that it is upon the statute books, urged it principally upon the ground that it was to be a selective draft, and they pictured in their minds and illustrated to us in their speeches the very great advantage and benefits there would be to the country through a selection by Federal agents and local organizations of those who were to go and bear the country's burdens and fight its battles and those who were to remain behind to keep in motion the wheels of industry, the fields green and well cultivated, and to continue the great output of the product of industry and agriculture, so absolutely essential to the success of our arms.

The plan proposed and thus outlined and defended was fine. It was this idea and thought and purpose that made the draft popular. But, unfortunately—and I am blaming no one in particular; I do not know that anyone in particular should be blamed—there has been very little selection. In my State many of the counties in the State until very recently were not subject to the draft because of the fact more than the quota of men had volunteered. But where the draft was applied there was practically no selection. The young fellows in charge of ranches, with hundreds of acres under cultivation, with large herds and flocks, supervising business, and farming enterprises requiring knowledge, training, and experience, vigor, and energy, possessing every quality necessary to the successful operation of these enterprises so valuable and necessary to continue and increase the food supply of the country, were not selected to stay at home in charge of such work.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In the main they did not ask for exemption. The very man that should be exempted under the plan and purpose proclaimed as that of the selective law is ordinarily the last man who will ask for exemption.

Now, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. A few days ago, in answer to my request of The Adjutant General of the Army to advise me if there was not some way by which the circumstances surrounding the young men who were taken from the farm might not be looked into, or looked over again, he replied that no exemptions were being made of men on account of their employment on the farm. Now, the law provides that exemption may be given, but evidently the law is being disregarded. If another law is framed along that line, it must be made in such language as that even the officers of the Regular Army will not dare to disregard it.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope that will be done. In some cases, I think, if there is any blame—and I am placing no blame anywhere—it rests with the district boards rather than upon anyone here. The idea of the selective draft was that it would catch the slacker; that it would take by the scruff of the neck the indifferent, the indolent, the shrinking—not to use the word "cowardly"—and put him on the firing line and reserve in the interest and for the benefit of his country some, at least, of the men essential to its agriculture and its industry. What I have said of our young farmers and ranchmen was true also of the men in the mines, and to some extent, at least, of those on the railroads—there was no real effort at the selection which the law contemplated and which was claimed to be its chief virtue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman give me the other three minutes?

Mr. LEVER. I feel that I ought to reply to the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman extend the time?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield to the gentleman two minutes of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. MONDELL. At the time the draft law was under consideration I expressed the opinion that under the draft, as under volunteering in the main, the men who would go would be the men who wanted to go, the men who were willing to go. And that has been the case. The very men needed to maintain industries and sustain them and to keep the agricultural and stock-growing production of the country up to the maximum, the men that the country needs at home, are the kind of men, of course, that most want to go; young, vigorous, virile, courageous, enthusiastic, loyal, patriotic; and there was no sort of effort made, so far as I know, to select to stay at home those most needed at home, though that is the very essence and basis

of a selective draft. If the conscription law is to be valuable in the way of its selection, it is and must continue to be the duty of the men who enforce and administer it to select men under it as they are needed to go or to stay at home, and not to send every man who is willing to go and keep at home the man who outrages high Heaven with affidavits that he ought not to go. We should retain at home the man needed at home, whether he himself makes any effort to come within the exemption. I hope in the future we will have an enforcement and an administration of the selective draft in keeping with its purposes, as stated by those who most strongly indorsed and approved it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for States Relations Service, \$3,150,820.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. LEVER] if he is willing at this point to return to page 45 for the consideration of the aeroplane-stock amendment which I offered on Tuesday.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina). Does the gentleman make a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask unanimous consent, if the chairman of the committee is willing.

Mr. LEVER. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to return to page 45 for the purpose of offering an amendment which the Clerk will report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington:

"And hereafter, during the existing state of war, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell without advertisement to any individual, firm, association, or corporation, at a fair value to be determined by him, national-forest timber which he shall find is to be used for war purposes; and he is also authorized, under regulations to be prescribed by him, to permit the War Department to take from the national forests such timber as may be needed in the prosecution of the war. The Secretary of War, under regulations to be prescribed by him, is hereby authorized to sell or otherwise dispose of any of the material manufactured from such timber which is not suitable for war purposes. Any moneys received on account of such material shall be deposited in the Treasury as provided by existing law."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment just offered.

Mr. LEVER. I wonder if we may not have an understanding as to whether or not the gentleman from Wisconsin thinks he is going to press the point of order, as he has looked into this matter, I suppose.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have given some consideration to this amendment since it was submitted day before yesterday, having called up the Forestry Service to ascertain the exact operation of the cuttings on the various forest reserves, both for spruce and other timber. I may say that the form in which the amendment was presented by the gentleman before it was modified, so as to have the funds derived from these sales go into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, is more acceptable to my view than the modified form providing that the funds received shall be deposited in the Treasury in accordance with existing law. Where the War Department obtains permission from the Forest Service to take such timber as it sees fit, culls out what is needed for its purposes, and then manufactures the balance in the way of lumber to be sold to the public, out of appropriations for the War Department, in my opinion the receipts should be turned back into the Treasury and not, as provided in this amendment, be turned back into the Forest Service fund for the benefit of the local district.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. My colleague from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] has an amendment to the amendment as finally presented by me which he thinks will solve that problem, and with the gentleman's permission I think he can make a statement in two or three minutes that will clarify the situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. With the reservation of the point of order pending, of course, I shall have no objection to the gentleman from Michigan or any other gentleman going ahead and explaining the proposition.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would substitute the word "cut" for the word "manufactured" in the third line from the bottom of the amendment as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At the present time the Government has issued orders which have been placed in the hands of the chief of the Signal Corps on the Pacific Coast, Col. Disque, who is stationed at Portland, Oreg., which orders permit the Government to com-

mandeer timber, no matter by whom owned, for the purpose of making rived spruce, which means split timber. The Government is commandeering timber from anybody's land and paying a certain price per thousand feet on the estimated amount of timber in the tree in such trees as are selected. Then the Government lets contracts to individuals to get out this timber and put it on cars for the Government, taking only such portion of the tree as can be worked into rived spruce, which is a very small percentage of the total product of the tree.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. About 10 per cent.

Mr. FORDNEY. Not to exceed 10 per cent, I would say, out of the very choicest trees that may be selected. For the trees selected the Government proposes to pay a given price per thousand feet, board measure, for all the product of the tree. Now, nine-tenths of the tree, after the portion suitable for making rived timber has been taken from it, must lie there in the woods, unless the Government may be permitted to dispose of the remainder of the tree where it lies. It will not pay the Government to take out of the woods timber which can not be worked into such lumber as the Government wants for aeroplane stock; but the balance of the timber ought to be disposed of to the contractor getting out the rived spruce or to some one, at such price as the Government may be able to obtain for it, in order to save it from loss, instead of leaving it there and letting it rot in the woods or be burned. The gentleman's amendment says "the material manufactured from such timber." Saw logs are not "manufactured" products of wood, and therefore if you substitute the word "cut" for "manufactured" it permits the Secretary of War or the Secretary of Agriculture to sell the remainder of the product of that tree where cut into logs and left in the woods.

Mr. STAFFORD. Carrying the process one step further, when the Government has carried this culled-out timber down to the factory, what would be left that might be disposed of by the War Department?

Mr. FORDNEY. I have a copy of the specifications, which call for rived spruce measured at the smallest end of the stick of timber, say 6 by 8 inches and up to from 14 inches thick to 36 inches wide, and not less than from 18 to 26 feet long.

Mr. MADDEN. What does "rived" mean?

Mr. FORDNEY. Rived means split.

Mr. MADDEN. Why does it not say so?

Mr. FORDNEY. The specifications say "rived"—to rive is to split.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me read the specifications, to show what a tremendous proposition this is. The War Department solicits farmers, lumbermen, contractors, and everybody who can go into the work to engage seriously and earnestly in the business of spruce production. These specifications provide:

All spruce purchased must be split by wedging. The use of explosives in any manner whatever is prohibited. Cants must be 18 to 26 feet full in length; four sides clear, not more than 14 inches thick nor more than 3 feet wide on the bark surface. Annular rings must not be less than six to the inch. Grain must be straight throughout the entire length of the timber, without waves, knots, or rot. Timbers should not be hewn or squared. The heart will always be removed. In selecting trees for this purpose only the finest specimens of live trees should be fallen, and no attempt should be made to utilize dead or down trees lying on the ground or which appear to have shaky or spiral growth or have been burned. No piece with pitch-pocket evidence will be accepted. Any abuse of these conditions will result in a rejection of the material and consequent loss to the producer. The opposite page contains scaling data which will govern inspectors and control the price paid for products.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me to state, further, I am familiar with this kind of timber—spruce—and it is not generally a straight-grained wood. There are only certain kinds of timber that grow that will split straight as if sawed, and spruce is not that kind of timber. Very likely one will find it twisted in grain or growth. When split it must be perfectly straight and square or the Government will not accept it according to specifications. No expert in the world can tell whether it is straight grained or cross-grained until the tree is felled and split. Then if it is found the least bit twisted, all of the tree is rejected. Unless you permit the Government to sell the tree where it lies after it is found that it is not suitable for riving you will destroy the timber, for if the Government can not dispose of the tree where felled, then the tree is abandoned to decay or to be destroyed by fire. Why, not save it?

Mr. STAFFORD. Assuming the case that the log has reached the lumber mill for some special use, and the War Department finds that it is not suitable for that special purpose, the Government might be able to use it for some other purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks that the time of the gentleman from Michigan be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. The timber must, before it has been accepted by the Government from the contractor, follow all of these specifications. Therefore it must be not more than 14 inches thick and 36 inches wide and not less than 18 or 26 feet long, and be absolutely straight grained, or it will not be accepted by the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Assuming that they do accept it and find some interior defect, what will the War Department do with the log when it gets to the lumber mill?

Mr. FORDNEY. There are some defects that are not visible before it is split. All the defects are exposed when it is split into a stick 6 by 8 inches square and from that up in size. Every defect is then visible and it must be perfect. The defects are visible after it is rived, and the rived timber will not be accepted unless perfect, which means it must be sound and straight grained.

Mr. STAFFORD. The log is going to be rived in the forest?

Mr. FORDNEY. Right in the forest where the tree is felled.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman suggests the use of the word "cut" instead of "manufactured." Why not use the words "cut or manufactured"?

Mr. FORDNEY. Then you are going to put the Government into the manufacturing business. What I want is to protect the Government in the sale of timber in the woods after they discover that it is not suitable for Government use. If it is suitable it will be taken out and manufactured by the Government and be used for making aeroplanes. If it is not suitable it is left in the woods and ought to be disposed of by the Government and allow it to obtain a reasonable price for that portion of the timber unfit for Government use.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. The gentleman's amendment only contemplates certain timber being left in the forest. Is there no timber that will be left at the mill?

Mr. FORDNEY. No, sir; the specifications call for a stick of timber squared a certain number of inches in thickness and width, when measured at the top end, not less than 6 by 8 inches and 18 to 26 feet long, absolutely straight grained when rived, not hewed or sawed, not prepared in any other way except split. Rived means split. Therefore, it must be perfectly straight, not twisty; no large knots; no defects of any kind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will allow me, I will read paragraph 6 of the specifications.

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is as follows:

6. This method of securing spruce for airplane construction necessarily will result in leaving considerable portions of each tree in the forest. It is directed that all limbs be cut from the main trunk of that portion of the tree left on the ground, and every other possible precaution taken to prevent possibility of fire. It is by this method that the Government hopes to double the production of spruce for airplane stock so urgently required at this time.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say that the Government has already selected trees in forests on the Pacific coast in the county where the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] lives. They have marked particular trees. They have measured the diameters of the trees, estimated the length and amount of timber that the tree will cut in feet board measure, and have notified the owners that the Government "will take those trees that have been marked," and that it will pay a certain amount per thousand feet for the timber. When they sell the timber they are going to abandon all except the portion that will make rived spruce, and this provision will allow them to sell the rest of the tree at some price. The Government ought to get some money for the balance of the trees which it will abandon in the woods. If you adopt this amendment, it can do it and will not have to manufacture it and sell it as a manufactured product.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. May I understand the exact status of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan? Does he propose to cut out the word "manufacture" and substitute the word "cut"?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; so that when the tree has been felled from the stump, is lying in the woods, after a portion is taken by the Government, it can sell the balance when cut into logs, and so forth.

Mr. WINGO. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's amendment, but I would like to offer an amendment to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, after the explanations made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I still have a point of order reserved against the amendment. Let me ask the gentleman from Michigan if his amendment goes in the Government can not manufacture the timber, but the Government would have the right to sell the trees now under existing law?

Mr. FORDNEY. With this amendment the Government would have the right to take the whole tree out and manufacture and dispose of it, but if thought desirable can sell the timber on the ground where it is cut instead of manufacturing; my amendment would permit this to be done.

Mr. WINGO. I think that amendment is a good one, but let me suggest that after the word "timber" you put in this language: "or such portion thereafter as may be suitable for war purposes."

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; that is all right.

Mr. WINGO. That would clarify it.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am in sympathy with the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands, then, that the gentleman from Michigan withdraws his amendment?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; I accept the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Washington by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. LEVER. Which is to be read for information.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I did not formally offer the amendment putting in the word "cut."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I shall offer that. Make it read "cut or manufactured."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Washington will be modified as indicated by him, to which amendment the gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report, and the gentleman from South Carolina is reserving a point of order against all amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment modifying the amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Insert before the word "manufactured" and after the word "material," the words "cut or."

Amendment offered by Mr. WINGO to the Johnson amendment: After the word "timber," insert "or such portions of such timber."

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the language may read as it would be if these amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment of the gentleman from Washington as it would read if the modifications of the gentleman from Michigan and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas were incorporated in it.

The Clerk read as follows:

And hereafter, during the existing state of war, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell without advertisement to any individual, firm, association, or corporation, at a fair value to be determined by him, national-forest timber which he shall find is to be used for war purposes; and he is also authorized under regulations to be prescribed by him, to permit the War Department to take from the national forests such timber as may be needed in the prosecution of the war. The Secretary of War, under regulations to be prescribed by him, is hereby authorized to sell or otherwise dispose of any of the material cut or manufactured from such timber or such portions of such timber which is not suitable for war purposes. Any moneys received on account of such material shall be deposited in the Treasury as provided by existing law.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The timber or lumber described by the gentleman from Michigan is timber or lumber purchased for war purposes?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. The Government is going into the forests with experts, marking such trees as the experts may designate, and selecting them, such as are suitable for aeroplane stock; and upon marking those trees and estimating them—estimating the amount of lumber in the tree where it stands—they pay to the owner of the timber \$7.50 per thousand feet for the timber in the tree. Then they take such portion only out of the woods as will make rive spruce.

Mr. HAUGEN. But the amendment provides that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell without advertisement to any individual, firm, or association.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; because the party who takes out this rived spruce while on the ground with his machinery, for that must all be taken out by machinery—lumbering is done on the Pacific coast with steam engines and cables and not with horses or cattle—the party who takes out the rived spruce while his machinery is on the ground will take out the balance of that tree and obtain such price as he can.

Mr. HAUGEN. But this amendment permits the sale of all timber that may be used for war purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I shall explain that as being in accordance with the desires of the War Department. The War Department, through the aeroplane-production section, is letting two kinds of contracts. Some of these are cost-plus contracts, and those contracts are being let to contractors—big loggers. The War Department is begging them to take the contracts.

Mr. MADDEN. What contracts—to get out the wood or to build aeroplanes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. To get out the wood. In those cases the logger is invited to run his logging railroad in and take all the timber—

Mr. HAUGEN. But I understand the amendment here applies to all lumber which is used for war purposes, which might be taken for the building of ships.

Mr. WALSH. What is there in this amendment to restrict that to aeroplane timber?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Nothing whatever. If the necessity arises when they need this timber to build ships, let them have it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then what is the use of talking about aeroplanes if it applies to all timber?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Because the War Department is working day and night to get aeroplane stock. The other portion of the amendment I have offered provides, if a section is being logged and a logging railroad run to it, that men then—small crews of men, farmers and contractors—will go on farther into the woods and find an individual tree in the forest reserve which has been marked for them by the forester, cut that down, rive it, and cut it into bolts small enough to get it out, and sell it to the Government, without the Forest Service being required to advertise that tree for sale.

Mr. HAUGEN. After all, it resolves itself into this, that we are to sell the lumber without advertising for 30 days?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; one phase of this amendment lets the War Department take whatever timber it wants—spruce, fir, hemlock, or any other kind—and the other phase of the amendment authorizes the War Department, in connection with the Forest Service, to go in away beyond the railroad or the wagon road and get out individual trees without advertising. The forestry people claim that they are embarrassed by the fact that they can not get the men to follow the advertising process and thus can not help the War Department in its great need.

Mr. HAUGEN. I have no quarrel with the War Department, but I have some question in my mind as to whether we should open the gates to the sale of timber without advertisement. We have found it necessary in the past to guard against that very thing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have brought, anticipating that, samples of the forest reserves' advertisements. I can tell him how the contracts run and how minimum prices are fixed. They have never had the trouble the gentleman anticipates, and in this war emergency we have got to trust the war chiefs.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I wish to inquire where these square timbers which are split or rived are to be manufactured?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They are in the woods.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. They split them into narrow or thin enough planks—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They are reduced to long blocks.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Where are the blocks manufactured after that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Demand is made that they be delivered at the nearest road or logging railroad.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What becomes of them then?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They are taken from there by the War Department probably to Rochester, N. Y.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from South Carolina—

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. LEVER. I would like to sound out gentlemen as to whether a point of order is going to be made on this proposition. If so, we are losing time. How does my colleague on the committee feel about this?

Mr. HAUGEN. I did not raise the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Before anyone makes the point of order I would like—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I think no one is going to make the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. I think I shall make the point of order—

Mr. HOWARD. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Has the gentleman from South Carolina the floor?

Mr. LEVER. I will take the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LEVER. I yield.

Mr. MONDELL. As I understand it, the gentleman from Washington desires this provision solely as it relates to material needed for aeroplanes, but his amendment is of the broadest kind and character, and would embrace anything and everything that by any possibility could be held or believed or conceived or be suggested by anyone in any way as directly or indirectly to be used for war purposes. That is a rather dangerous provision to put into a bill like this without careful consideration and consultation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It gives the Secretary of War the right to say.

Mr. MONDELL. It gives the Forest Bureau the right to sell practically everything in the way of forest material without advertisement—that is what it amounts to—in time of war. If the gentleman has no thought in mind except aeroplane material, why does he not confine the amendment to aeroplane material?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. For the reason, if the gentleman will do me the honor to listen, the gentleman has been in Congress long enough in recent years to know that in order to get an amendment considered on this floor it has, almost in every case, to have the approval of the department behind it, and this amendment is from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand the Department of Agriculture does not want to do this with regard to aeroplane material unless they may have the bridge thrown off entirely?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman misunderstands entirely, and I hope that during this war emergency he will not do any department an injustice. The Forestry Service sets timber values. No contract has ever been made so low for timber out there that there has ever been any occasion for criticism. They want to make contracts that will lead to other contracts, so as to induce a man to build a logging railroad up, say, a stream to get all spruce within reach, while other individual contractors can go on far into the woods, rive and drag our spruce blocks from localities that will not be reached by a road in the next 50 years.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman's idea is that the Forest Service should be relieved of the necessity of advertising in the matter of most of its sales?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. As a war emergency only, as the resolution says.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say, in answer to the gentleman from Wyoming, that no man on God's green earth can tell what the balance of the tree that is not made into aeroplane stock is going to be manufactured into. If he does know, he knows more than any man that God Almighty has made who is in the lumber business. The balance of that tree might be manufactured into material to make dry-goods boxes or could be used for building ships or for railroad ties or for the construction of any kind of building that could be constructed out of wood, and if he can describe what that timber is to go into and what it shall be manufactured into, let him name it now.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield, although I think the gentleman's proposition is without merit.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman talks about boxes and other kind of material for which these trees or parts of trees may be used. If that is the case the amendment would be of no value or use whatever. Boxes are not war material.

Mr. FORDNEY. We can not both talk at once, I want to say to the gentleman there is not more than 10 per cent of the product of any spruce tree that will make rived spruce, out of which to make aeroplanes. What are you going to do with the other 90 per cent, can you tell?

If you can, you can do more than I can. It may be worked into bridge timber, it may be put into railroad ties, it may be put into inch lumber, it may be put into dimension stuff, 2 by 6, 2 by 8, 2 by 10, square timber. Anything outside of lumber can be made. Can you tell? Of course you can not. Therefore, 90 per cent of that tree must be put into something or it

must be wasted, and unless you provide some way for the Government to dispose of 90 per cent of the tree, you are going to pass a law that will compel the wasting in the woods of 90 per cent of the tree. Ship timber is not made in this way. On Gray's Harbor, Wash., where those contracts are now being put into effect, they manufacture 700,000,000 feet of lumber a year. Not one-tenth of that timber will be called for ship-building timber. Any quantity of timber may be called for by the Government for all other purposes for which the Government is using timber, except rived spruce for the manufacture of aeroplanes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, we could talk here almost indefinitely on this. I think members of the committee know whether or not they wish to press the point of order. I will say to my colleagues on the committee that I talked with a member of the Forestry Service this morning, and he told me that the amendment as originally proposed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] was prepared by the legal department of the Department of Agriculture, and the Forestry Service feels there is a very great need for legislation. Why they did not submit it to the committee in the regular way I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They thought the specified plan of advertising would be sufficient, and I did not appear before the committee on that account. The matter of advertising for this spruce has been given six months' trial in this emergency, and has not brought in enough. Now the War Department has taken hold, and put an agent out there. When it was thought that the bringing in of spruce by the method of advertising would be sufficient, there was no occasion to call for an amendment.

Mr. LEVER. I made my statement and said it was my intention to withdraw the reservation of the point of order, but if any Member desires to renew the reservation he may do so.

Mr. MONDELL. I desire to renew the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOWARD. I wanted to ask the Chair if he observed the point of order I made. I thought it had been reserved. Now, to save time, I am going to make the point of order, and if this thing is right it can go on in the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. In the opinion of the Chair this amendment is clearly subject to the point of order, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I move to strike out the last word. I suspected that an uninformed somebody on the floor of this House might make a point of order against this urgent and necessary war legislation, and I presume that the Member who did it will be the first to go out into the country and cry "Let us cut red tape."

Here is a proposition that is hard to handle. Both the War Department and the Department of Agriculture have complained that they are embarrassed by their inability to make the pending laws fit the necessity for getting out their spruce. It is not an easy matter to coordinate the governmental departments, even on a matter as important as this.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HAUGEN. The amendment does not limit the sale of the lumber for the purposes the gentleman has discussed. Now, then—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think it does. It says "for war purposes."

Mr. HAUGEN. "War purposes" takes in the building of ships and everything that might come in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If it comes to that, why should not the Government use timber in the Government's own forest?

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman knows that it is customary in any department, with any contract, even of small amount, to advertise for bids.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Now, then, Mr. Chairman, right when this point of order is being made, I have received this telegram:

Legislation permitting prompt action in securing timber from Federal reservations, and authority to dispose of that portion of timber not required for aircraft purposes, will be of great assistance to this office in supplying emergency requirements in connection with our air program—

And so on. It says further:

It is not practicable to have the desired timber logged. The operation becomes entirely too expensive to attract any commercial concern. Any assistance in this matter, I can assure you, will be of great value to this office.

Col. B. P. Disque, of the United States Army, was sent out there by this Government to urge our people to work day and night to get the spruce with which to make these thousands of

aeroplanes you are bragging about, and that are going to fly into Germany. He has been placed in entire charge of the timber situation in the Northwest. He is crippled by red tape.

Mr. HAUGEN. I understood the language to be "to sell or otherwise dispose."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That phrase has just been inserted by amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO]. I do not know just what its effect will be.

Mr. HAUGEN. In what way do you propose to dispose of this lumber than by sale?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not know. I believe the passage of this amendment will result in putting into the hands of the War Department a sufficient quantity of spruce, even if it is necessary to continue the sending in of regiments of forestry soldiers, as is now being done.

Mr. ROBBINS. If it were limited to aeroplanes, would that meet the objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not know. I have tried every way I could to meet various objections. The main object is to cut the red tape that is delaying the aeroplane program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say a word in explanation of my making a point under the circumstances, as the gentleman from Washington has in part explained. This amendment, even if it was drawn by the legal department of the Department of Agriculture, was very loosely thrown together. I went up and took care to read it. Now, under this amendment, if they want this spruce for aeroplanes and nothing else, they can get it, but I do not propose under a loose-jointed amendment like this to see the great masses of the forests of this country absolutely depleted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This is the only Federal forest of spruce suitable for aeroplane stock in the United States.

Mr. HOWARD. It does not make any difference where it is. I would say the same thing if it were in Georgia, or in Alabama, or in any other State. I am talking about a business-like administration of the forestry affairs of this Nation by those people who pretend to speak for them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. When the gentleman is dead and gone, probably the spruce will still be there.

Mr. HOWARD. I am like the gentleman from Michigan; I think two gentlemen can not talk at the same time. The gentleman is very enthusiastically supporting his amendment. But here is what could be done with respect to those contracts made out there on the Pacific coast by these big lumbermen for those tremendous spruce trees. They could go there and take one log out of each tree and use it, and absolutely devastate that forest, and use the balance of it for their commercial purposes under this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I can not yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will not the gentleman yield in the interest of fairness? The gentleman wants to be fair?

Mr. HOWARD. Of course I mean to be fair, and I think I am fair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How could they do as the gentleman suggested and follow the War Department's specifications about getting out the spruce?

Mr. HOWARD. It is not a question of how they would do it. It is a question of what they would do. They are getting here under a private contract, without advertisement and without competition, the right to go into a national forest and cut any number of trees they want, and use any amount of that timber; an infinitesimal amount of it, or a third of it, or a half of it, or any other part of it, and use it for commercial purposes. Then these gentlemen can come in and take advantage of their patriotic offer to cut timber for the construction of aeroplanes, and take 99 per cent of the timber which they get for commercial purposes and use it. It is not for the Government of the United States.

If you want this particular thing to be done, perfect an amendment that will protect these great forests of trees out on the Pacific coast, and not let those men go in there and take advantage of the situation to wring profits out of it.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Has not the Government the right to go in there now and use 10 per cent of that timber, and waste the remainder of it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I must insist that we move along here a little bit. This matter has been passed over. We have had two amendments offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the situation. This part of the bill was passed over when it was reached in its regular order, and unanimous consent was granted to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] to return to it to offer an amendment. The gentleman from Washington has called that amendment up. A point of order was made to it, and the point of order has been sustained against it, and the proper thing for the committee to do is to proceed to read the part of the bill where we stopped.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, was a point of order made, or was it simply withheld?

The CHAIRMAN. It was made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. LEVER. It was made and sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is sure that the members of the committee will all agree that the Chair did not try to cut off legitimate discussion.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the gentleman from Georgia withheld the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Georgia made the point of order, and the Chair correctly sustained the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe I am recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the amendment is not in order until we reach that part of the bill where we left off.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the Chair recognized me.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming may have five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming will admit, I think, that—

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Wyoming can get five minutes by moving to strike out the last word. Five minutes is not any longer now than it will be hereafter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if I can ask unanimous consent to withdraw these amendments and return again to this section of the bill for the purpose of offering a perfected amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the amendment was withdrawn by the making and sustaining of the point of order against it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Then I ask leave to offer the amendment again before the bill is disposed of—to offer an amendment relative to this use of spruce in national forests for war purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to offer, before the bill is disposed of, an amendment relative to the supply of spruce in national forests for war purposes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman from Washington that I shall not object, but I do not want him to ask leave to go back until we have completed the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will try to perfect the amendment in the meantime.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman prepares an amendment, let him submit it to the chairman of the committee; and if it is thought to be wise, without thrashing the matter out again, to accept the amendment, that can be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that after the bill has been read through he will be permitted to return to this section and offer an amendment pertaining to the obtaining of stock from national forests, with all rights to make points of order against the amendment reserved. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the suggestion is made here that when the gentleman gets his amendment prepared, if the bill is not then completed, he can ask unanimous consent to recur to the proper place to offer his amendment. There is no necessity for asking unanimous consent now to offer an amendment that is not yet prepared. I think the gentleman can get unanimous consent to offer it when he has prepared it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There can not be any valid objection to getting unanimous consent now. I will prepare an amendment; I will have it rewritten.

Mr. BORLAND. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri objects.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a gentleman in the floor or a member of the committee who is not favorable to such action as may be necessary to expedite the taking and securing and manufacturing of material needed for aeroplanes. None of us, until this matter was presented to-day, was aware of the fact that there was any difficulty in the procurement of this material. This is the first we have heard of it. For my part, I should be delighted to support an amendment, properly guarded, that would serve the purpose of aiding and expediting the securing of this class of material.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have had some rather unhappy experiences so far in this war in the matter of contracts and agreements under wide authorizations. We have not been saying much about them. It is not proper that we should; but we do not want to have that kind of thing increase and multiply as it undoubtedly would under this provision. As the gentleman has drawn his amendment it is as wide as the heavens. It reaches from horizon to horizon, and it would practically authorize the Forest Service to sell any and all material from the forests without advertisement. The gentleman does not want that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. For war purposes.

Mr. MONDELL. "War purposes" is an all-embracing term in time of war. There is very little material used that in one way or another, under some form of construction, could not be held to be intended, directly or indirectly, for war purposes—ships, cantonments, and all of the buildings which the Government might need here, there, or elsewhere, or material which any contractor under the Government might claim to use for war purposes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does not the gentleman realize that the reason a man throws off his coat when he goes to fight is because he wants to be unfettered? Then why would the gentleman fetter the Government, that is fighting for its very existence?

Mr. MONDELL. That all sounds very well, but it does not get anywhere or mean anything. A cavalryman going into battle would not throw the bridle off his horse, if he had any sense. Of course, there might be spectacular gentlemen who would want to do that in order to cut a flurry and a figure, but sensible men want to guide things, even in time of war. The gentleman can very easily, by a slight modification of this amendment, confine it to timber needed in whole or in part for the manufacture of aeroplanes, and if he will do that I do not think anyone will have any objection. I can understand how the Forestry Bureau would be very glad to have the opportunity to sell as they see fit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Do they not sell it as they see fit now? Do they not specify the price in every advertisement?

Mr. MONDELL. If there are no regulations in any way hampering them in their sales, what necessity is there for any further amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Except time. Now, here is a contract let for 5,000,000 feet of spruce a month. That means the slaughtering and cutting down of 50,000,000 feet a month, of which 45,000,000 feet will lie unused in the woods. Is that conservation in any form? That is why this amendment is offered.

Mr. MONDELL. We do not aid the war in any way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman may think he does not.

Mr. MONDELL. And we do open wide the door and the opportunity for scandal if we relieve the bureau, as we would under this amendment, of obligation to advertise sales.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Would the gentleman rather this spruce would stay in the forests for the next 50 years, or would he rather have it put to some use?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no; and the gentleman knows that it is not necessary that it should. It is not necessary to set fire to all the woods in the Northwest because somebody wants to burn a strip somewhere to stop forest fires. It is not necessary to invite all sorts of scandals in the sale of material in order to allow aeroplane material to be sold without advertisement. It has not been generally necessary to do that even during the war in the other and wider activities of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inquiries in regard to systems of road management throughout the United States and for giving expert advice on this subject, \$40,040.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee with reference to this item and the following item. What is the difference between giving expert advice in regard to sys-

tems of road management and giving expert advice with regard to road building and road maintenance? Are there two different bureaus or officials? What is the difference?

Mr. LEVER. In a general way, the character of the work done under this item is in the laboratory. It is their research work and not their field work. The only field work they do here is in giving advice to States as to the best method of organizing for road purposes.

The next item which the gentleman refers to, investigating the best methods of road making, is really their field work.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the indulgence of the House for just a moment to make a statement out of order and not on this bill now before the House. This morning our good friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], for whom every Member of this House has the greatest respect and admiration, made a statement in relation to the collector of internal revenue in the city of Boston. I was not present on the floor of the House at the time. If I had been I would have made a reply at that time, and would not take the time of the House now, but for the fact that I shall be called out of town to-morrow and therefore will be unable to be present to do so. I have talked with our good friend [Mr. FORDNEY] and have told him I wanted to make a statement. He has consented that I should do so. In the gentleman's statement this morning he read an advertisement in the Boston Herald, which advertised that the collector of internal revenue in the city of Boston was to give lectures on the income tax, and for these lectures they were to charge a fee of \$4.

Naturally the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] objected to that, as any Member of this House would feel like doing, and he gave vent to his feelings on the subject of any member of the Government doing so.

I want to say to this House—and I will ask any of the Members to verify what I have to say by calling up the collector of internal revenue, Mr. Roper, of whom Mr. FORDNEY spoke so highly, and I repeat what Mr. Roper has said to me—that the collector of internal revenue in Boston is one of the most efficient, trustworthy, painstaking officials in this Government. He has worked untiringly to build up his department to a high state of efficiency, and he has done everything in his power, not only himself but with his entire office force, to give to the public every bit of information and the best service possible. For that he has been commended by the officials here at Washington.

Now, as to this advertisement, Mr. Malley himself has given notice in the newspapers of our city that he and his assistants are willing to go to any chamber of commerce, any board of trade, any business organization and explain to the men of his district the income tax, and tell them what the law is and what it contains. He has been doing this and has been paying his expenses out of his own pocket. His men have been doing the same. The Bentley School of Accounting and Finance, taking advantage of the opportunity of having some one lecture upon this question, asked Mr. Malley if he would give a course of four lectures to the pupils of the Bentley School in the city of Boston, and he agreed to do so. He was surprised to learn that this organization had advertised these lectures, for which they were going to charge a fee. As soon as he found it out, and before the lectures were given, he sent for Mr. Bentley, compelled Mr. Bentley to withdraw the advertisement, and in the Boston Press the following Saturday compelled him to print a further advertisement, saying that Mr. Malley would not charge any fee and would not give the lectures if any fee was to be charged.

I want to say in fairness to Mr. Malley that he has won the respect of every business man in his district. I can not speak too highly of him as an official, and I know that his superiors will say, as I say, that he has given untiring of his own time to any business organization or any organization in the entire district, and also the time of any of his corps of assistants to go out and explain the income tax free gratis and at his own expense, outside of business hours. To show how he is doing this I will place in the record a news article from the Boston Globe, Friday, January 25, 1918, and another from the Boston Herald, of Wednesday, January 30, 1918, which printed the Bentley advertisement:

[From the Boston Globe, Jan. 25, 1918.]

MALLEY TO EXPOUND INCOME-TAX PUZZLE—ANNOUNCES FREE LECTURES AT CITY CLUB NEXT WEEK—COLLECTOR TO HELP PUBLIC MASTER FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.

A course of six free public lectures on the Federal income tax will be given from 10 to 12 each morning next week by Collector John F. Malley at the Boston City Club. He will give the official information needed by individuals in meeting the Government's requirements.

Everybody is invited by the Boston City Club and by Collector Malley to come and get information directly from the internal-revenue collector. In addition to his personal services each morning Collector

Malley will have present a corps of deputies to assist in the preparation of Federal returns. All you need to bring is a memorandum of your 1917 income and expenditures.

"The people are now awake to the requirements placed upon them by the new war revenue law," said Collector Malley in announcing the lecture course. "They are realizing that the filing of the returns is a purely personal duty explicitly imposed by Congress on individuals and corporations."

"The Boston City Club has generously tendered me the use of its big banquet hall. I have accepted this public-spirited offer and will personally deliver the talks and answer all questions between the hours of 10 and 12 each morning."

"This is the only course of lectures I have arranged to deliver personally. Any published announcements of private courses to be delivered by me or under my supervision or auspices are not authentic."

"There are severe penalties for failure to meet income-tax requirements. With the opportunities I am offering for information and assistance there will be slim excuse for the man or woman who after March 1 is found to be a delinquent."

[From the Boston Herald, Jan. 30, 1918.]

WILL LECTURE ON INCOME-TAX LAW—COLLECTOR MALLEY TO SPEAK AT CITY CLUB TO-DAY.

Collector of Internal Revenue John F. Malley will talk on the income-tax law requirements relating to executors, administrators, trustees, and other fiduciaries at to-day's free public lecture at the City Club at 10 o'clock. The hour between 11 and 12 o'clock will be given up to quizzes by those who desire further information relative to a particular requirement, and the collector, who has become a regular encyclopedia on income-tax law, will answer all queries.

The series of free public lectures is given by the collector in order that everyone may realize what responsibilities the Government will exact from those who come within the income-tax law. Everyone who earned a good salary or was successful in his business or profession will be compelled to make a return to the Government and pay a tax.

Collector Malley told his hearers yesterday that he and his deputies will inform the people of Massachusetts regarding the law, but that it is the duty of the individual to attend to it. If he waits until the last week he may have to take his own chances.

Yesterday Collector Malley had a big class of lawyers, trustees, bookkeepers, and others who will be called upon to make up the income-tax returns, and they volleyed him with questions. He told them that the Government would play entirely fair but would expect fair play in exchange, and any attempt to "hold out" would be discovered and the punishment fitted to the case.

Chief points about the income-tax law are that every person who earned \$1,000 last year and had no wife or husband to support will have to file a statement. Any person with a wife or any woman with a husband who earned \$2,000 or more will have to file a return, and any person who does not live with wife or husband is classed as single and comes within the \$1,000 class.

There are several perplexing angles to the law, but the collector is holding a free lecture course to explain away the perplexities.

I feel, in fairness to Mr. Malley, that I should make this statement, as I know my good friend from Michigan is ready to accept what I say to him, because I have gone to the pains of calling Mr. Malley up by long-distance telephone, and I am stating the facts as he stated them to me.

I know that Mr. Malley has been giving these lectures. I heard him before an organization in my district where he lectured on the subject. He is going to-night to Springfield to speak before the chamber of commerce of that city on the question. I want the House and the country to know that this man is a patriotic citizen of this country and is doing his duty faithfully by his country. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen from Michigan asks unanimous consent to address the committee for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. Gentlemen of the House, I made the statement this morning from a public ad which had been sent to me by a friend from Boston. After the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] communicated by telephone with Mr. Malley he made the statement to me that he has made here in the House. I do not want to do Mr. Malley an injustice. If it is true that he declined to lecture before that school, where an admission fee was charged, I do not want to do him the injustice that my statement would do him, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted not to print in the RECORD my remarks of this morning. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to withhold from the RECORD his remarks of this morning. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of the chemical and physical character of road materials, \$51,220.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture a question rather than to impart any special knowledge about this section of the bill. In Pennsylvania we have a well-organized highway department headed by a commissioner. The entire State is districted; over each district there is a local superintendent. The information has

reached us in my State that the Government is frowning upon all manner of new work, and especially on public roads, and of the character of works such as new structures is not to be carried forward during the coming season, and that the building and construction of highways further than the maintenance of those now built and required to keep up intercourse between the people. If that is true, why make these enormous appropriations? I know it is also asserted that the commissioner of banking is frowning upon any loans that are made to contractors that are undertaking new buildings the purpose being to discourage any new enterprises so that the entire energy of our people and capital of the country may be devoted to the prosecution of the war and its successful conclusion.

I understand that highways are among the first public improvements to be cut off, frowned down, and construction thereof prevented as far as possible during the coming season. If that is true, what is the necessity for these large appropriations to the highway department? I do not mean by this to say that I believe it is right, for I think that highway building should go on as much as possible. I know that in Pennsylvania, where we have embarked on a great scheme of highway improvement throughout the Commonwealth, a part of the roads are under the State supervision, laid out by State engineers, and the whole work under the protection of the State, and are to be built and maintained as State roads, and we are anxious to go on with the work, but if the General Government is going to take the position that enterprises of this kind will not be carried forward, I should like to know it, and why it is necessary, if that is so, to appropriate these large sums of money. I do not approve of it, but I would like the information. The very last work that should be curtailed and stopped is the building and improving of our public roads. Let us, by all means, continue most vigorously the improvement of our public highways.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, as far as I know there is none, and no testimony before the committee shows that there is any purpose on the part of anybody to discourage road building in the United States. If there is such a purpose, I wish to put myself in hearty agreement with the suggestions of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has just taken his seat. If we are going to distribute our farm products economically and quickly during the war or after it, we must have a better system of rural roads. But even if the statement were true, the item which is immediately under consideration is an item for testing road material that may be sent into the laboratory in Washington, and the item immediately following is for the purpose of testing road materials in the field. Of course, the small sums of money that are carried in this bill for road purposes could not build many roads, and they are not for that purpose.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment, and I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania what the ruling is as to discouraging loans by the Federal Reserve System for the purpose of erecting new buildings?

Mr. ROBBINS. I can only say, like information that reaches most Members of Congress, I have not read the ruling, but I heard that such a ruling had been made.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have heard so vaguely, but I have not been able to find it.

Mr. ROBBINS. I have not been able to find it in print, but I understood from a banker in Greensboro, my native place, that that was a fact.

Mr. BORLAND. I think, if the gentleman will yield to me, that I can throw some light on it. I think the whole impression has arisen from the fact that a short time ago when the coal shortage began to be felt there was an order made by the War Industry Board or priority committee that open cars should not be used for sand, brick, cement, and other material until the coal shortage was at an end. But there was no discouragement of the general contract business; it was a priority order that cars adapted for coal should be used for coal and nothing diverted for sand, cement, and brick.

Mr. ROBBINS. That is not the ruling to which I refer.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is not the ruling the gentleman from Pennsylvania has in mind.

Mr. BORLAND. What other ruling is there that the gentleman can point out?

Mr. ROBBINS. The ruling that I refer to is the ruling that discourages banks from making loans to contractors who contemplate using the money to embark upon new constructions that are not regarded as necessary.

Mr. BORLAND. If there is any such ruling, I hope the gentleman will put it in the Record.

Mr. LONGWORTH. There has been a rumor of such a ruling.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It has also been in the public press.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But it has been in a very vague form. The purpose of my inquiry is to ascertain whether there has been a ruling which prevents Federal reserve banks from loaning money to contractors, and I would be very glad if any gentleman here could give me some information on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation, including the best methods to apply in practice; the different kinds of power and appliances, and the development of equipment for farm irrigation; the flow of water in ditches, pipes, and other conduits; the duty, apportionment, and measurement of irrigation water; the customs, regulations, and laws affecting irrigation; for the purchase and installation of equipment for experimental purposes; for the giving of expert advice and assistance; for the preparation and illustration of reports and bulletins on irrigation; for the employment of assistants and labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for rent outside of the District of Columbia; and for supplies and all necessary expenses, \$82,440.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The discussion of the question of appropriations for the building of roads by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS] brings to my mind a meeting with the committee on roads representing the Chamber of Commerce of Johnstown. We have a live chamber of commerce in our city, and its members are very enthusiastic in the construction of good roads. Many of you know that there is located in that city one of the largest industrial plants of the country, and that it is now largely engaged in the manufacture of munitions for the Government. Owing to the present congestion in railroad traffic, the management of the plant is at times seriously handicapped in procuring the necessary materials for the conduct of the works. At the meeting referred to the question was asked whether or not the Government would assist in the construction of a road leading from Johnstown to Jenners in Somerset County, a distance of about 18 miles, so as to connect with the Lincoln Highway. The statement was made by the superintendent of the Midvale Steel Co. that if such a road was constructed the steel company would operate a line of trucks between Pittsburgh and Johnstown so as to facilitate the movement of materials required for the making of munitions and other things. I have undertaken to ascertain upon what basis the Government would render assistance, and find that the Post Office Department, the War Department, and the Agricultural Department are permitted to build roads under certain conditions. The Post Office Department may use money to establish postal express or motor routes; the War Department can appropriate money to improve roads adjacent or leading to military reservations, so that it is necessary for us to look to the Agricultural Department for present aid. Our people should have the road mentioned and they are willing to do their share in its construction.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, of course the method pursued in matters of that kind is that you have to start with your highway commissioner in your State. If the highway commissioner in the State will adopt a certain road and approve it and send that recommendation in to the Secretary of Agriculture and he approves, then the State, county, or municipality, or whatever it may be, furnishes 50 per cent of the money and the Government furnishes 50 per cent of the money under the general road act.

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman say that the consent of the highway commissioner of the State of Pennsylvania will bring about the construction of that road?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It will contribute to it. It has to be first approved by the State Highway Commission.

Mr. ROSE. Well, my information is that the matter is now in his hands.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. When he approves it he sends the recommendation to the Secretary of Agriculture, and if the Secretary of Agriculture approves it the Government contributes 50 per cent and the State 50 per cent.

Mr. SNYDER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi know of any particular instance where the whole modus operandi has been carried out and a single road built since we passed the Federal road act?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I know some in course of construction in my own district.

Mr. SNYDER. I have not heard of any before, and I am glad that it is in the gentleman's own district.

Mr. ROSE. We have the largest city in the nineteenth congressional district of Pennsylvania, and Cambria County, where it is located, has the poorest roads in the State. I understand that the proposition mentioned by the gentleman from Mississippi has already been complied with; that it has been presented to the highway commissioner of the State. If the application be approved, then am I to understand that the Agricultural Department will fall in line and make its proper contribution?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. As I stated a moment ago, if the State highway commissioner adopts it as one of the projects in that State and sends it up to the Agricultural Department and the Secretary agrees to it, approves it, then the Government contributes 50 per cent of the cost.

Mr. ROSE. Now, I think I can see some daylight for us.

Mr. FARR. What are the county officials doing with the roads in Cambria County?

Mr. ROSE. For answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR], let me say that the officials of Cambria County will gladly do their part, and the townships affected will do their part, and I believe that the highway commissioner will approve the plan.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That is not sufficient. You have to get the approval of the State highway commissioner in Pennsylvania.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question of the gentleman from Mississippi. I would like to know the cost of that road being built, where the Government pays 50 per cent.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I am not advised as to the full cost of it. I do not know what it is to cost a mile. It was adopted as a project.

Mr. KREIDER. If the contract is let, there must be a fixed price.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I am not advised as to the details in reference to contracts or in reference to what work is being done. All I know is this: The State Highway Commission of Mississippi adopted this, which is project No. 1 in the State, and it goes across from Tupelo, Miss., across part of Lee County, across Itawamba County into Alabama. The State highway commission adopted it and then put it up to the Secretary of Agriculture and he approved it.

Mr. KREIDER. What I am interested in is to know the cost of that road.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That I could not state, because I am not advised.

Mr. KREIDER. I want to answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania and possibly those who do not understand how this law operates. The Federal Government will contribute toward the building of a road in Pennsylvania or any other State. The Federal Government divides the appropriation made by Congress to the several States. However, first, I might say each State is entitled to that allotment. Pennsylvania has its share. That money can be used for the building of what is known as a Federal-aided road. First, the route and method of construction have to be approved by the State highway department, then by the Federal authorities. If the cost of the road does not exceed \$20,000 a mile the Federal Government will pay 50 per cent, the State pays 25 per cent, and the county 25 per cent. If that road, however, costs over \$20,000 a mile the Federal Government will not pay to exceed \$10,000 a mile for their share.

If the road costs \$35,000 a mile, as it is estimated the road will cost which is under consideration through Lebanon County, Pa., then the Federal Government will not pay over \$10,000 a mile, and the \$25,000, which is the excess estimated cost, will have to be divided between the State of Pennsylvania and the county of Lebanon. There are 20 miles under consideration now, at an estimated cost of \$35,000 per mile, or a total of \$700,000. Of this the Federal Government would pay \$200,000, the State of Pennsylvania \$250,000, and Lebanon County \$250,000. Now, my objection to this whole proposition is this, that I understand that the Government will not approve of any road that will cost what I consider a reasonable amount. That road through Lebanon County, 20 miles, is the old Reading and Dauphin Turnpike. It should not cost over \$10,000 to \$15,000 per mile to construct a substantial road on that macadam roadbed; but the Government will not, it seems, approve of a road constructed at a cost of less than \$35,000 per mile, which places a burden of \$250,000 on little Lebanon County for 20 miles of road. In effect, the proposition to Lebanon County is, "You must pay \$250,000 toward the building of this road and take the \$35,000 per mile road or nothing."

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman will permit, what material is it that costs \$35,000 a mile?

Mr. KREIDER. I asked the State highway commissioner, and he told me it would be constructed of limestone and cement.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Does the gentleman consider that a reasonable cost?

Mr. KREIDER. I say unreasonable at \$35,000 a mile.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I think so.

Mr. KREIDER. My objection is that we must either take that or nothing.

Mr. ROSE. Of course, since the building of highways several years ago material has advanced in price, but a great many counties in Pennsylvania, it seems to me, have so much better roads than we have in our county. We have none worth speaking of.

Mr. BELL. The gentleman's county has not been on the job.

Mr. ROSE. On the job all the time.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF MARKETS.

Salaries, Bureau of Markets: One chief of bureau, \$4,500; 1 chief clerk, \$2,000; 1 administrative assistant, \$2,500; 1 clerk in charge of supplies and accounts, \$2,250; 1 administrative assistant, \$1,980; 7 clerks, class 4; 10 clerks, class 3; 1 clerk, \$1,440; 26 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, \$1,380; 1 clerk, \$1,320; 1 clerk, \$1,300; 91 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,140; 3 clerks, at \$1,100 each; 75 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 5 clerks, at \$1,080 each; 7 clerks, at \$1,020 each; 1 clerk, \$960; 24 clerks, at \$900 each; 3 clerks, at \$840 each; 2 clerks, at \$720 each; 1 mechanical assistant, \$1,380; 1 laboratory helper, \$900; 1 laboratory aid, \$960; 3 laboratory aids, at \$900 each; 1 laboratory aid, \$840; 7 laboratory aids, at \$720 each; 1 photographer, \$1,400; 1 photographer, \$1,200; 1 supervising telegrapher, \$1,620; 1 telegraph operator, \$1,400; 6 telegraph operators, at \$1,200 each; 7 telegraph operators, at \$1,080 each; 1 telegraph operator, \$1,020; 1 telephone operator, \$600; 2 draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 1 draftsman, \$900; 1 map tracer, \$900; 1 map tracer, \$720; 1 map tracer, \$600; 1 map tracer, \$480; 2 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; 1 laborer, \$840; 2 laborers, at \$720 each; 4 laborers, at \$600 each; 7 messenger boys or laborers, at \$600 each; 7 messenger boys or laborers, at \$540 each; 20 messenger boys or laborers, at \$480 each; 14 messenger boys, at \$420 each; 2 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 messenger boy, \$300; 1 charwoman, \$540; 5 charwomen, at \$480 each; 2 charwomen, at \$300 each; 8 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$387,850.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, in no paragraph of the bill is there such an inordinate increase of appropriation as in this salary list of the Bureau of Markets. We rarely find, not even in bureaus connected with the Agricultural Department, an appropriation doubled over last year's appropriation bill. Although the Congress authorized for clerical force an appropriation last year of \$197,820, we find at one fell swoop this year it is being doubled, and more, to the extent of \$387,850. Now, that is "going some," to use a slang expression, even for a bureau of the Agricultural Department, and particularly it is going some in these times when directions have been given to economize, so as to utilize appropriations for war purposes. Certainly some explanation should be given as to this inordinate increase in clerical-force activities of this bureau. I understand from members of the committee that there is a very energetic head of this bureau—in the phrase of the speech, a "live wire"—who is looking around for every activity in which to employ the clerical force in the department and out in the field. Why, in some of these items we find the clerical force being more than doubled. Will the chairman of the committee give some reason why this force should be doubled in the course of one year in appropriation—I will not say doubled in the extent of the personnel, but certainly doubled in the amount appropriated for this service—and, also, why you are paying the clerk in charge of supplies and accounts, a new item, \$2,250, which is more than the chief clerk of the bureau receives? Rarely do we find any subordinate clerk receiving more than the chief clerk. Perhaps he was heretofore employed at this high salary under the lump-sum appropriation which allowed the head of the bureau to give him any salary that he saw fit. He is now being transferred to the statutory roll. If that is the case, the committee is rather helpless, after the abuse of the lump-sum appropriation, to correct it by reducing the salary; but there should be some harmony in salaries where you pay a clerk in charge more salary than you do a chief clerk.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, that is the longest question I have been asked to answer in a good long time.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been rather easy on you in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. LEVER. The general explanation of this situation is this: The Bureau of Markets is a comparatively new organization in the Department of Agriculture. It is an organization that has made rapid strides. I confess that.

Mr. GARNER. But is doing work in proportion to the funds appropriated for it.

Mr. LEVER. But, as suggested by my friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER], I believe that this bureau is doing work in proportion to the funds appropriated for it. Last year we in-

creased the amount for the Bureau of Markets very considerably, probably doubling the appropriation, although I am not sure of the exact figures. And a great many clerks were employed under the lump-fund appropriation, and these clerks are now being transferred to the statutory roll in accordance with the law.

In reference to this clerk to which the gentleman from Wisconsin calls particular attention, my information is that he was carried on the lump-fund roll last year and is transferred to the statutory roll under the law at precisely the same salary which he received under the lump fund. And that is true in all these cases here.

Mr. STAFFORD. What additional activities have been undertaken by this bureau that have occasioned this tremendous increase in clerical force?

Mr. LEVER. I could very easily explain those as we come to them in the bill, item by item.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not wish to take the time of the committee, inasmuch as the gentleman wishes to finish to-night. Here we have an appropriation for clerical force in this bill which is double the amount of last year, and some of the items for the clerical force have more than trebled.

Mr. LEVER. For instance, I will say to the gentleman from Washington that in the marketing and distributing work of the bureau there has been an actual increase of \$12,580. In market reports on fruits and vegetables there is an actual increase of \$50,000. In market reports on live stock and meats there has been an actual increase of \$10,000. In food-supply investigations there is no change. In the item for food-products inspection there is no change. In cotton standardization there is an apparent decrease in the item, but actually no change. In rural cooperation and organization there is no change. In State cooperation and marketing work there is an actual increase of \$22,000. In the grain standardization work there is actually no change. In the enforcement of the standard-container act, which is an activity that was given to the Department of Agriculture, there is a salary increase of \$1,000. In general administrative expenses there is an increase of \$6,000. In the enforcement of the cotton futures there is an actual increase of \$25,000. In the enforcement of the grain-standard act there is no change. In the general administrative work there is no change.

So that, even this year we are recommending for this bureau a larger increase than we have recommended for any other bureau of the Department of Agriculture. In fact, it is about the only one where we did make any substantial increases. Last year we did the same thing, for the reason, as the gentleman knows, that some years ago there was a tremendous propaganda here around the Capitol to organize a bureau of markets, as they called it, with enormous appropriations, I think running as high as \$50,000,000, to build terminals and warehouses, and everything on top of the earth.

This bill has been built up out of that propaganda, as it were, but we have tried to build it up along sane and conservative lines. And I may say this to the gentleman, and I would like the members of my own committee to bear witness to the fact, that while the committee has in many cases allowed increases, we have cut their estimates in practically every one of these items here; and the committee has repeatedly warned the Bureau of Markets that the great danger ahead of it was that it would run so fast it would get tangled with its own legs and come down with a crash. The committee has been trying to hold its hands both on the bureau itself and on the demand on the outside for increased appropriations for this service.

Mr. GARNER. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows of a bureau in the entire Agricultural Department that is doing any more good than the Bureau of Markets?

Mr. LEVER. I believe it is not only doing a good work now, but I believe it is destined to be the great bureau in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. GARNER. That is exactly what I think about it—that it is destined to be the most important bureau of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. ROBBINS. You have mentioned here the increased benefits in giving market reports to the growers of fruits and vegetables. Who gets the benefit of that knowledge?

Mr. LEVER. Any association of fruit growers or vegetable growers at their own expense, or any individual may get it at his own expense.

Mr. ROBBINS. And it is sent broadcast over the country to those who apply and who are engaged in that line of enterprise?

Mr. LEVER. That is true. And I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I believe no line of activity in the

Department of Agriculture is bringing back more in money than the information that is being given by the bureau to truckers throughout the country. My colleague here, who is always interested in this particular subject, knows something about the organizations that have received the benefit of the service in his own district. So while the increases are comparatively large compared with the increases in the other bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, it must be borne in mind that this is a new service and has not settled down to a fixed appropriation.

Mr. ROBBINS. You hope now that you have gotten to a place where we can call a halt?

Mr. LEVER. I think we have reached a point now, I will say to the gentleman candidly, where we can begin to have some more definite idea of the value of the work that is being done by that bureau. Heretofore the work has been more or less experimental in its nature, because it has been an entirely new service, and a new field of operation in economics in this country.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in reference to this item I wish to say this, that I most heartily concur in the statement made by the chairman of the committee and by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], to the effect that no more practical work is being done by the Department of Agriculture than that which is being done by this particular bureau.

Some reference is made to the telegraphic and mail service furnished to the growers of fruits and vegetables. In two or three counties in the district that I have the honor to represent, the farmers are engaged in the growing of truck—asparagus, cantaloupes, cucumbers, beans, lettuce, potatoes, and all other kinds of vegetables and fruits.

Any grower can make an arrangement with the Office of Markets to have sent to him every morning a telegram which will give him full information as to the market price of asparagus, cucumbers, cantaloupes, etc., in every important market of the East, and in addition to that, the number of cars loaded with those products en route to the markets of the East—the number of cars being ascertained at the Potomac yards and other junction points. Any fruit growers' organization or truck growers' organization, by making that arrangement with the department, can for 25 or 50 cents receive a detailed statement every morning as to the market conditions in the East. That information also is furnished to consumers. The Office of Markets endeavors to have it published in the newspapers.

And now they have installed a new service. The representatives of the Office of Markets in Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Chicago, and other points will serve the fruit grower or the vegetable grower and the commission house in the way I shall undertake in a moment to describe. Heretofore the common experience has been, if a grower consigns a car of cantaloupes to Boston, for example, he might receive next morning, or two days thereafter, a wire to the effect that the cantaloupes had arrived in bad condition. He would be absolutely at the mercy of the commission merchant who sends him that telegram. He had no way of ascertaining the truth of the condition as to the cantaloupes.

Now, the Office of Markets, when called upon by the grower, will inspect that car, and wire him whether or not the cantaloupes are in bad condition; and the very presence of that inspector of the Office of Markets on the ground is going to assure the fruit grower and the vegetable grower of the United States that no longer will he be defrauded by some dishonest commission merchant, who, by his dishonesty, has created a great distrust of the commission merchants among farmers. For that inspection a charge is made by the Office of Markets, but the charge is infinitesimal in comparison with the advantage and the security that the fruit or vegetable shipper has in having on hand a man who, as his representative for all purposes, can ascertain the truth of the statement made by the commission merchant.

The result is that this feature is going to encourage men to produce more truck in this country, and to produce more vegetables in this country, and more fruit. There is no service being rendered in the whole Department of Agriculture that is so practical as this service, which has been referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS].

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. KREIDER. Does the Markets Bureau undertake to dispose of produce for the benefit of the shipper, or for the shipper?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No. I am satisfied they do not. This service is to advise the shipper of the price of

vegetables or the price of fruit on particular days. Heretofore from Florida to Virginia the growers were in the dark. They shipped at times, car after car, of canteloupes or cucumbers into the city of New York when the market was flooded, and at the same time the market in Philadelphia might have been without any canteloupes or cucumbers on that day. There was no intelligent diffusion of information. But once you give the farmers a true statement of the facts, you may rely upon a better distribution of truck and vegetables, so that there will be no dumping in one city, as, for instance, in New York, while in Boston or Cleveland or Buffalo there is a great demand for the article.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the Department of Agriculture in the matter of onion seed has made any investment? I received a letter the other day from a man who grows onions, and he says that he understood that the whole crop of onion seed from a certain island had been taken over by the Department of Agriculture. I refer to Bermuda onions.

Mr. LEVER. I have no definite information about that, but my recollection is that seeds such as onion seeds would be distributed through the regular distribution.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I refer to the market for the buying of onion seed at this department. Suppose a man writes in and wants to know where he can buy onion seed. Does this department take care of that?

Mr. LEVER. A person can get that information from the Department of Agriculture easily enough. The department will put him in touch with such firms or individuals from which he can obtain the seed.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. And for the sale in the fall, of onions, potatoes, and so on, do they keep abreast of the situation, so that when a man writes in at any time he can get the information he desires as to that?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. The first service which the department did was in respect to onions in the State of Texas, and I think they have worked out a very good plan of getting to the people the information they desire.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws the reservation of the point of order. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEVER: Page 75, line 23, after the word "two," in the word "laborers," insert a hyphen (-).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm and nonmanufactured food products and the purchasing of farm supplies, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the department, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the transportation, marketing, and distributing of farm and food products, \$292,240;

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I had intended to offer an amendment at this point, but I am satisfied that it is subject to a point of order. I do, however, wish to call the attention of the Committee on Agriculture and also the attention of the House to what appears to be an unfair discrimination against the agriculturalists residing near the large centers of population. The county which I have the honor to represent in part—Middlesex County, Mass.—while it is rather densely peopled and contains many large manufacturing establishments, at the same time is one of the leading counties in the United States in the value of its agricultural products. These agricultural products are principally the result of intensive cultivation of the soil by market gardeners, a class of skilled agriculturalists.

On December 13 of last year I received a letter from one of my constituents, who is the president of the Boston Market Gardeners' Association, inclosing some resolutions adopted by that association. These resolutions are as follows:

Whereas the Boston Market Gardeners' Association, in common with similar associations in other cities, is contributing to the support of the Market News as edited and issued by the Bureau of Markets of the United States Department of Agriculture; and
Whereas all similar service is maintained for other industries without charge; Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association protest the payment of such money by private associations, especially where such Market News is given to the public indiscriminately, and petition the Department of Agriculture to assume the entire cost of this service henceforth.

J. WINTHROP STONE,
President Boston Market Gardeners' Association.

Mr. Chairman, I took this matter up personally with the Secretary of Agriculture, who is a personal friend of mine, and he promised me that he would look into the matter very carefully. On December 27 I received from him a letter, which reads as follows:

DECEMBER 27, 1917.

Hon. FREDERICK W. DALLINGER.

DEAR Mr. DALLINGER: You called at the office a short time ago and left with me a letter to you from Mr. J. W. Stone, president of the Boston Market Gardeners' Association. Mr. Stone incloses a copy of the resolutions adopted by the association petitioning the Department of Agriculture to assume the entire cost of the Market News service conducted at Boston.

The local market reporting service, such as that carried on in Boston, has been conducted during the past season in eight of the large cities of the country. In each case approximately one-half the expense involved has been assumed by the local truck growers' association, some other local organization, or by the city itself. When the strictly local nature of the work is considered, the justification for dividing the expense in this way is clearly apparent. The market gardeners around these cities have been receiving a very specialized service, which has consisted of tabulating accurately the quantities of various commodities brought in by each wagon sufficiently early to enable our representative to post the totals of the main commodities on bulletin boards in time to guide the truck growers in their selling operations. Later the agent gathers accurate price information and then prepares a popularly written article covering the morning's business on the market for the information of the housewife. So far each agent has acted independently in this work, and there has been no attempt to exchange information by wire, except in the case of Boston and Providence, where our representatives have kept in touch with each other daily by telephone.

You will see, therefore, that the benefits of this work are largely restricted to the communities in which the service operates. Although other market gardeners' associations have expended greater sums for the work than the Boston Market Gardeners' Association, they have not asked that the Department of Agriculture assume the entire financial burden. In fact, they seem to be very anxious to receive the service under the financial conditions outlined. It is of interest, also, in this connection, that while the Boston Market Gardeners' Association obligated itself to pay from \$75 to \$100 per month, commencing last August, it has not been called upon to do so until recently, because of the fact that the local committee on public safety assured practically all the financial burden which belonged to the association. To date the Bureau of Markets has expended approximately \$1,100 in the work and the committee on public safety about \$800.

It is clear, therefore, no discrimination whatever has been or is being practiced against the Boston Gardeners' Association. In view of the strictly local nature of the service, I do not think it would be proper for the Department of Agriculture to assume the entire expense of the work. It may be that the city authorities or some other appropriate local organization would be willing to continue to pay a portion of the expenses. It is immaterial, of course, to the department whether they are paid by the association or by the city authorities or by other proper organizations.

I imagine that Mr. Stone has in mind the general market news service which the Bureau of Markets has been conducting for the past two or three years. This service is for the benefit of entire regions, or for the country as a whole. While the department bears all expenses connected with the collection of the information, those who desire to receive the data by telegraph are required to pay the toll charges. As indicated, the work at Boston and other cities is strictly local in character and is not in the same category as the national or regional service.

Mr. Stone's letter and its inclosures are returned herewith.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON.

You will notice that in this letter the Secretary makes the point that this service is local. Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been the policy—and the Secretary is carrying out this policy—to conduct the Department of Agriculture according to area and not according to population. For instance, the State of Nevada, according to the estimates of 1915, has about 100,000 people, but it has a vast area. All the publications issued by this Bureau of Markets in the State of Nevada are published without any expense to the people of Nevada and sent to anybody who pays the usual fee; but the Boston Market Gardeners' Association, which is operating in a district having a population of between one and one-half and two million people, and the other market gardeners' associations in the large centers of population have to pay one-half of the expense of getting out this publication. It seems to me that this is a wrong policy. Here are these big centers of population that are bearing the great burden of Federal taxation, and yet in order for the Government to publish this information, which is public information of great importance to the food commission and to the people generally, particularly in this time of emergency, they are asked to bear one-half of the expense. It is a small matter, but it is an unfair discrimination, and ought not to continue. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of this item for acquiring and diffusing useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm and non-manufactured food products calls to my mind a very interesting suggestion made by the Wyoming wool growers in annual convention at Douglas, in my State, a few days ago. The wool growers suggest that as the wool clip is gathered it be assembled at central points in the country, the National Wool Growers' Association acting as the agent of the Government in that behalf, and that thereafter, to quote the words of the resolution of the association—

After wools have been concentrated and worked into commercial grades the Government representative take over, for account of the Government, such grades and amounts as are suitable for military requirements, the remaining wool to be sold either by public auction or by allotments to manufacturers for their actual milling requirements, in proportion to the available supply, and in charge of the aforesaid authorized committee.

Whether or not a procedure of this sort is practical there will be a difference of opinion, but it certainly is entitled to very careful consideration. The methods and procedure for the sale of wool in this country have never been satisfactory. They have left altogether too great a gap between the price the producer received and that which the cloth manufacturer paid for the finished wool. In Great Britain they have a system of auction sales which works very well, I am told, and the meat of the suggestion which I have just read, contained in the resolution, is in line and in harmony with the practice in Great Britain.

I am quite certain that if a plan of this sort had been followed last year, when it was presented in my presence by representatives of the National Wool Growers' Association to the Council of National Defense, it would have resulted in a very great saving to the Government—a saving of possibly 20 or 30 per cent of the price finally paid for wool by the Government. It would have given the grower as good a price as he did receive, and it would have furnished the Government with all the wool needed in the uniforms of our soldiers, so that it would not have been necessary, as it was claimed to be, to introduce shoddy in these garments. It would have equalized the distribution of the wool for use in the country generally. I think the suggestion then made was a most excellent one. It should, I think, have been adopted. But it was not. The Wool Growers' Association again suggest it to the Government, and I think it would be very well indeed if it was given careful consideration.

The wool could be gathered without difficulty at central points, the Government could take the wool it needed at a fair price easily ascertained and determined, and the balance sold, as it is in Great Britain, at auction. That would give the grower a fair price, it would protect the Government and lead to a general and equitable distribution of the wool products of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To make investigation relating to the production, transportation, storage, preparation, marketing, manufacture and distribution of agricultural food products, including the extent, manner, and methods of any manipulation of the markets or control of the visible supply of such food products, or any of them, by any individuals, groups, associations, combinations, or corporations, \$48,800.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 77, line 20, after the word "manufacture," insert a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the quality and condition of fruits, vegetables, and other food products when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate, subject to the payment of such fees as will cover the cost of service rendered and to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, \$113,000: *Provided*, That the certificates issued by the authorized agents of the department shall be received in the courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the quality and condition of the products so certified.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the entire paragraph.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I took some exceptions to a portion of this paragraph when it was before the committee—the employment of inspectors by the Bureau of Markets to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the quality and condition of various kinds of farm products when received at the market to which they are sent. I did so because, it seemed to me, that in this form it does not properly describe or prescribe the duty and authority of the

bureau or rights of private parties. If it is a proper function of the Bureau of Markets or any branch or department of the Federal Government to enter into the business of determining between the shipper and the consignee the question of whether or not the contract between them has been complied with, to furnish evidence as the basis of a claim for a reduction of the price, or for damages, as the case may be, then the duty and authority to be performed and exercised should be given careful thought and a full and complete measure adopted in which this duty and authority shall be clearly defined and the rights and obligations of shippers and consignees clearly established.

This bureau, as has been said, is a very important branch of the department. It is doing splendid work. The chief of the bureau is one of the most intelligent, active, progressive men I know in the department. He is enthusiastic; in fact, if he has a fault it is that he is too enthusiastic—trying to do too much. The danger is, as the chairman of this committee a moment ago very well said, that he is trying to do too much and trying to go too fast. He is also in danger, in his enthusiasm, of going outside of the proper line of marketing and taking up other work, as can be pointed out in other paragraphs as well as in this, without supplementary legislation.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman ought to say in fairness that this proposition was put on the food-production bill in the Senate, and not at the suggestion of the chief of the bureau.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I believe it was started or provided for in the food-production bill during the last session of Congress, finding its way through an amendment adopted by the Senate, and I approved it as a part of that emergency legislation. In my judgment it is not a market work at all, as this bureau in this section is directed to pursue it, and the Government ought not so to undertake it.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman think it is a proper work for any bureau of the Government to undertake?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have said that it was not proper for this bureau as here directed, and I question if it is a proper activity for the Government of the United States at all.

Mr. MONDELL. These gentlemen serve as referees, do they not?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes; they do just what this language authorizes them to do. A large number are employed and stationed in the large markets in the country. In case of a complaint they investigate the condition of the shipment and make a certificate as to the condition in which the goods were received, and it is the basis of a claim or of settlement or evidence used in disposing of the controversy between the shipper and the consignee.

Mr. MONDELL. Is the Government reimbursed in any way?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Up to this time the Government has not been reimbursed. The men have been paid entirely out of the Treasury of the United States for such services as they performed. At my suggestion the words "subject to the payment of such fees as will cover the cost of service rendered" were incorporated in this paragraph. So far as improvement is made in the methods of the department. Those who are interested in this inspection, those who profit by it, will be required to pay for it. But my contention is that it is improper—work outside of the duties and functions of the Bureau of Markets, as now provided by law. In my judgment this paragraph as it stands ought not to be incorporated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman waive that for a suggestion? If the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is going to make a point of order on this I think we better have that done, so I can offer an amendment on this proposition which I think will not be subject to the point of order. Does the gentleman feel that he ought to press his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. The more the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] speaks the more I am inclined to press the point of order. Perhaps he may say something that will change my position.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am not particularly interested in the point of order. I am speaking with the idea that I may possibly influence the committee in its opinion of this item.

Mr. LEVER. There are just two ways of getting at this proposition to determine what the will of the House is on the

proposition. One is to have a vote on an amendment which is not subject to a point of order, and which carries out the general idea of this work. The other is for some gentleman to make the point of order against this, and if it be subject to the point of order, then to have it go out, and then we can discuss the proposition on its merits.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I shall give way and permit the Chair to pass upon the point of order raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin insist on the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, at the invitation of the Chairman of the Committee, I make the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I would not have the gentleman put me in that attitude. I am not suggesting an invitation at all. I am not sure that this language is subject to the point of order, and I shall argue the point of order if it is made. But I think that would clarify the situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then to accommodate the gentleman, and not at his suggestion, I make the point of order.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a few minutes?

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall be glad to.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair will submit the request of the gentleman from Michigan that he be permitted to continue the discussion for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman will let the point of order be decided. I shall offer another amendment which I think is clearly in order, but I think this one is.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on this item before it is materially changed. I regard it as one of the most important items in this whole proposition.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Texas has any idea that he can persuade the gentleman from Wisconsin to withdraw his point of order, I shall be delighted to have him use his persuasive powers upon him.

Mr. STAFFORD. He has already had that wonderful persuasive power satisfied by my withdrawing the point of order and reserving it for the accommodation of the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. I think we will not accomplish anything unless we get the gentleman to withdraw it absolutely.

Mr. STAFFORD. He has not asked me to withdraw it entirely. He has only asked me to reserve it, and I am accommodating him in order that he may exercise his persuasive powers to influence me further.

Mr. SUMNERS. I do not know who has the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] had the floor, and he was temporarily deprived of it by a colloquy between the chairman of the committee and several other gentlemen. The Chair will submit the request of the gentleman from Michigan that he be permitted to address the committee. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. I shall not, but I shall at the end of his time object until we clear up the point of order.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair is going to pass on the point of order and the chairman of the committee is to submit another proposition, I may want to speak on the new proposition; and as time is limited and as the chairman is disposed to refuse very much time, perhaps I had better wait until the new proposition comes up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I think we will make time in getting rid of the point of order on this proposition.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I feel that way about it.

Mr. LEVER. And as I find I can not finish the bill this afternoon, I think it will be better to argue the point of order if the gentleman from Wisconsin is going to make it.

Mr. SUMNERS. The gentleman from Wisconsin has been kind enough to withhold the point of order, and I would like to be heard on the general proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS. I hope that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] may not insist upon his point of order. Gentlemen, it is a fact that in the sale of agricultural products the same difficulties are met with which are met in the sale of rural credits. In the sale of rural credits we standardize rural credits, concentrate them, and establish a system of inspection, which inspires the necessary confidence which makes it practicable for people in New England, for instance, to purchase loans on farms in the gentleman's own State—on farms which they have never seen. They do not know who owns them. They make their purchases not upon their confidence in the owners nor in the land, but upon their confidence in the

system of inspection. Now, in the sale of agricultural products which move from the point of production to far-away points of consumption, it is absolutely essential for systematic and economic distribution that there be this system of inspection, whether commodities are shipped for sale or move under prior sale. Without such inspection the man who purchases what he has not seen or the man who ships without prior sale are largely gambling. The only way to avoid that is for the purchaser to go to the point of production and personally inspect or the seller to accompany his commodity to the market, and of course consumers must pay for the trip in the price they pay. Now, you gentlemen know that as a matter of fact that farmers living far from the markets do not know to whom to ship their products; they do not know whether they will get a square deal if they send to these great distributing centers or not. It is imperatively necessary to any plan to reduce cost of distribution and enlarge our possibilities for production that there be somebody there who represents neither party but who serves both, performing a service to commerce similar to that of a public weigher. For these reasons I hope that the gentleman from Wisconsin will not insist upon his point of order, but permit this service to be developed in this country, so that the man who has something to sell will have confidence to send it into a far-off market, if necessary, and know that no dishonest commission man is going to defraud him out of his product and send him back this sort of statement, "Your stuff got here in bad shape. Send us \$13 to pay freight."

You gentlemen who represent agricultural districts know that thing has happened, and that very thing has done more to destroy the truck-producing industry in diversified farming sections than any other one thing. Producers are not in organizations sufficiently large to bridge the full distance between production and consumption except in territories where production is specialized and highly concentrated. You all know that as a matter of fact common sense—

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. I will.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says. I think he is mainly correct, but does not the gentleman think before this system can be carried out it will be necessary to pass a national law authorizing the incorporation of societies among the farmers—

Mr. SUMNERS. I do not think so. I hope to see the Government do the common-sense and necessary things and thereby insure justice without the necessity for such an organization. It would have a power which I hope may never find its way into the hands of any class of people. I am regarded here as a sort of farmers' champion, but I know they are made of the same clay as other people. They are no safer custodians of great power than any other class would be. I warn the country that we are driving them into these great organizations, and some day the country will pay for it. Say what you please, the wisest public policy is to insure class justice without the necessity for class organization to get it. This is merely an experiment—it is not an experiment, either. We all know that the man who lives out in the West, for instance, and would ship his commodities to Chicago, the ordinary, every-day farmer, he can not hire somebody to go there and see whether he is getting a square deal or not. He has nobody to watch his interests and the result is he does not take the chance; with the result that much of the productive energy of this country is not utilized. I sincerely hope that the gentleman from Wisconsin—

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. I will.

Mr. HAUGEN. This is in line with the standardization act. The purpose is that somebody may determine the value of the products shipped to the market.

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAUGEN. Its condition and also its value in fixing the standard, the value of the product as it is shipped.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, we are departing entirely from the old-time established policy of the individual looking after his own trade affairs and allowing Government agents to do the work for him. It is a system of paternalism that, if once inaugurated, will extend not only to the principal trade centers, as herein provided, but will extend to other localities throughout the country.

True, as stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], it will develop in such extraordinary fashion that the amount appropriated will run into millions, if not tens of millions, of dollars. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that it is legislation on the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I offer the following amendment as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert as a new paragraph, in lieu of the paragraph stricken out, the following:

"For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers the condition as to soundness of fruit, vegetables, and other food products, when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That certificates issued by authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I either make or reserve the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I will ask the gentleman to make the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. The point of order is that it is legislation on an appropriation bill not authorized by existing law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the suggestion of the gentleman that this is not authorized by existing law, I desire to call the Chair's attention to the act of Congress known as the food-survey law and food-control law, on page 2, and I quote to the Chair the following language.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman kindly indicate what section he is reading?

Mr. LEVER. I am reading from section 8, near the middle of page 2. It says:

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers the condition as to soundness of fruits, vegetables, and other food products, when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe:

Provided, That certificates issued by the authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained.

And then the amount of money is stated. In the amendment I have offered we put in the amount. The Chair will recognize in the language, just read, I think, that it is the law and will continue to be the law so long as this war lasts, the identical language of the amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from South Carolina let the Chair see that?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. And I would say to the Chair that this act is to remain in force, if he will notice the last section of it, during the war. While the Chair is looking at the act, I would like to modify my amendment—

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it may be done.

Mr. LEVER (continuing). By inserting the amount, namely, "\$113,000."

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will you amend it also by including the words I suggested in the committee, that the cost of it be paid?

Mr. LEVER. I think that would make it subject to a point of order. I am offering the exact language of the current law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee admits that the authority on which he bases this amendment is limited to the contingency as found in the enabling act, the food-survey law and the food-control law, to the duration of the war. The duration of the war is a contingency that may end at any moment.

The amendment that is offered by the chairman of the committee is not limited, as the original act is, to the duration of the war. The war may end during this present fiscal year, and if this bill was presented to the House after the war is concluded, under the rules now existing it would be subject to a point of order. Allow this amendment to be held in order in its present phraseology, and if the war comes to an end prior to the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill at the next session of Congress, the fact that we have undertaken this work without any such limitation as the existing law provides would make a similar provision in order. But if this authorization is limited to the existence of the war, that would present a different question. The law as it stands today only authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake this work during the existence of the war. As soon as the war terminates the authority lapses. But if this amendment is agreed to and the war terminates, he would have authority to still continue it, and under what authorization?

Under an authorization of law carried in an appropriation bill, that is contrary to the rules of the House of carrying legislation on appropriation bills. In its present form, undoubtedly, Mr. Chairman, I contend that the Chair should rule that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. Chairman, one thought further, in amplification of the idea presented just now. All this legislation of a war emergency character which was passed at the last session of Congress and which is contained in this act is limited to war emergency and war exigency, and it could be used as a vehicle to make permanent enactments in this appropriation bill for all time—

Mr. ROBBINS. And in other appropriation bills.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; and other appropriation bills where the appropriation would be germane. It is the vice from which the rules of the House seek to protect its legislation against having it incorporated in appropriation bills. Certainly Congress would never have authorized much of this legislation that is limited to war exigency by making it permanent for all time. Now, the gentleman from South Carolina is attempting to utilize an emergency legislative matter to make it permanent law.

Mr. ROBBINS. And it would apply to every one of the 10 bills yet to come.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will indulge me for a moment, I wish to suggest to the Chair that the rule requires that legislation on an appropriation bill can not be had; a change of existing legislation can not be had. This is neither legislation nor a change of law.

It is true that we frequently refer to the fact that some amendment is a change of permanent law. But no law is permanent. Congress can amend any act or repeal it when it sees fit to do so.

It is true that the life of this act is limited by the act itself; but until the time comes when the conditions are fulfilled it is the law of the land. I submit that the point of order can not lie.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] offers an amendment against which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] lodges a point of order, claiming that it is new legislation, and that therefore it is not in order on a general appropriation bill.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXI, no amendment changing existing law shall be in order upon an appropriation bill. Therefore the question presents itself to the Chair as to whether or not the proposed amendment is new legislation. Under the act "To provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products," approved August 10, 1917, there is a provision of law identical with the amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The gentleman from Wisconsin contends that the act of Congress that the Chair has just cited lasts only during the continuance of the war, which is an uncertain contingency, and that the Chair would not be authorized to hold the amendment is in accordance with existing law. The Chair is of the opinion that the only matter for the Chair to decide is whether the law is in existence at the time the Chair is to pass upon the amendment authorizing it, for any law may be subsequently repealed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the Chair permit a question in that particular?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would prefer not to. Section 3814 of Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, provides:

A paragraph in an appropriation bill reenacting verbatim an existing law is not subject to a point of order. On February 5, 1904, the Agricultural appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, when Mr. MORRIS SHEPPARD, of Texas, proposed the following amendment:

"*Provided*, That the purchase and distribution of seeds and plants by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare, untried, and uncommon to the country, or such as can be or have been made more useful and more profitable by special breeding, or such seeds and plants as may be improved by transplantation from one part of the country to another."

Mr. Sydney J. Bowie, of Alabama, made a point of order that the proposed amendment involved legislation.

After debate, the Chairman said:

The Chair is ready to rule upon this amendment. If the Chair has made no mistake, it is a verbatim copy of the law as it now exists. That being the case, it has been held that while it is unnecessary and perhaps almost not good form, yet is not strictly subject to a point of order. It is simply reenacting a portion of the United States statutes.

The Chair is of the opinion that there is law authorizing the legislation proposed in the amendment and that the amendment simply proposes an appropriation to carry out existing law, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not recall whether or not I got the consent of the committee to modify my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman did.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire how long the gentleman from South Carolina intends to run to-night?

Mr. LEVER. I hope to run until half-past 5.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is an important amendment—one of the most important amendments included in the bill—and I hope the gentleman can see his way clear to move to rise and discuss it to-morrow, when we shall have a larger audience.

Mr. LEVER. Let us see, then, how much time is desired. I wish very much to dispose of this item to-night. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] desire some time?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes. I have an amendment on which I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I would like to have 10 minutes before we adjourn to-night.

Mr. LEVER. On this amendment?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. GILLET. Why not let the gentleman from North Dakota use his 10 minutes to-night, and then rise?

Mr. LEVER. I am willing to do that. But in doing so let us see if we can not reach an agreement as to this matter. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto may close—in how many minutes?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think the gentleman should try to close the debate on this amendment to-night. We can finish the bill certainly to-morrow, when we will have a larger attendance.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will say to the chairman that there will be a larger attendance to-morrow, and when this matter is read, and the Members attending know what it is, there will be requests for time.

Mr. LEVER. I know, but the gentleman from Michigan will recognize the fact that it is not up to the committee, who have to sit here all day long, to take care of those who are not here; and while this is an important amendment, if gentlemen desired to discuss it they knew it was in this bill and could have been here and protected themselves. I think the gentleman will agree that I have been pretty liberal in trying to protect everybody; but we must finish the bill to-morrow, and I am not so sure that we can do it in a couple of hours.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Is not the gentleman willing to give two hours to this, an hour on a side?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto may close in 30 minutes, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and the other half by myself.

Mr. STAFFORD. That would not even accommodate the gentlemen who are now here present on this side waiting to speak. There are requests for 30 minutes on this side right now.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young] does not want to speak on this. There are 20 minutes asked for on that side and 5 minutes on this side. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto may close in 50 minutes, one half to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and proposed amendments thereto close in 50 minutes, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] to control 25 minutes and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] to control 25 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 9054, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FOCHT for one week, on account of illness.

INCREASED COMPENSATION TO POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, I report herewith the bill (H. R. 9414), granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal

Service, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed with the report (H. Rept. No. 279) and be referred to the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee presents a bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the bill be put on the Union Calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves all points of order on the bill, and the bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads who desire to do so may have five legislative days within which to file minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in regard to the Garabed free-energy proposition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution for the purpose of promoting efficiency for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, for lessening the expenses of the war, and restoring the loss caused by the war by providing for the employment of a discovery or invention called the "Garabed," claiming to make possible the utilization of free energy.

WIDOWS' PENSION BILL.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 9093) to amend the act approved September 8, 1916, chapter 470, Statutes at Large, Sixty-fourth Congress, relating to pensions, was reported in the regular way through the basket. I have since learned that it is a privileged bill and that the report should be made to the House. I therefore wish to make that report on the bill to the House and not through the basket.

The SPEAKER. Is it a general pension bill?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman takes the bill from the basket and reports it in the usual way of a privileged bill. The bill is ordered printed and is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

PAIRS.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CHANDLER] placed a statement in the Record undertaking to show that I had violated a pair agreement. I do not know that I would have cared to make any reply if it had not been that I now hear—

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I would like to know by what right the gentleman is undertaking to make this statement?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Then I shall not state the reason, but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in order to make a reply to those statements, for the purpose of stating the facts with reference to this entire matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state once more, and hopes that the Members present will convey the statement to others, that the House has nothing on earth to do with pairs.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 1, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the 12 months ending October 31, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 602); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the president of Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to the Congress of the United States for the year 1917 (H. Doc. No. 888); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the president of Capital Traction Co., transmitting report of the Capital Traction Co. for the year ending December 31, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 889); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the United States Food Administrator, transmitting itemized statements of purchases and disbursements made by the United States Food Administration and by the United States Fuel Administration for the period from December 1 to December 31, 1917, inclusive (H. Doc. No. 890); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 273) to extend the time for cutting timber on the Coconino and Tusayan National Forests, Ariz., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 277), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SULZER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8563) to amend the homestead law in its application to Alaska, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 278), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. STEENERSON, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1607) for the relief of David E. Gray, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 275), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WALTERS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2635) to authorize the issue of a patent to certain land in Alabama to William M. Wilson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 276), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 7721) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Parker; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 9138) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Lawlor; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 9142) granting a pension to William E. Martin; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 9358) granting a pension to Elmer Wagar; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 9402) to authorize credits for enlistments in the naval service of the United States in the

operation of an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9403) to provide for the condemnation, acquisition, and construction by the United States of America of telegraph and telephone lines, properties, and holdings in the several States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia, and to provide for the operation of said telegraph and telephone lines and properties by the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9404) to fix the requirements governing the receipt, transmission, delivery, and preservation of messages of interstate telegraph and telephone companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9405) fixing the price for use of telephones at private residences within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 9406) to increase the productive agricultural area of the United States by the reclamation of arid swamp lands therein; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 9407) to provide for the preservation of and compensation for diminishing levels of Lakes Michigan, Huron, Erie, and Ontario due to diversion or withdrawal of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago, Ill., and fixing the maximum amount of such diversion and conditions under which same is authorized; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 9408) to authorize additional pay for enlisted men of the Navy, and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard detained beyond the expiration of their terms of enlistment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 9409) to provide for the authorization of money to be used in the grading and terracing of the grounds around and adjacent to the memorial arch at Valley Forge; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9410) to provide for a site and public building at Lansdowne, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 9411) to amend an act entitled "An act in reference to expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad," approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 9412) authorizing a survey of Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 9413) to authorize coal-mining leases in the Navajo country; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 9414) granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. PARK: Resolution (H. Res. 240) authorizing the Postmaster of the House to employ an additional messenger; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Resolution (H. Res. 241) authorizing the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to investigate the present system of mail censorship; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 234) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the entry under bond of certain shipments of distilled spirits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9415) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9416) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9417) granting an increase of pension to Mathias Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9418) granting an increase of pension to David Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9419) granting a pension to Margaret Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9420) granting a pension to William McCommon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 9421) granting a pension to Julian A. Wiggins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 9422) granting a pension to James M. Snoddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 9423) granting an increase of pension to Lester N. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9424) granting an increase of pension to Charley S. Lunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 9425) granting an increase of pension to Matthew McGoldrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9426) granting a pension to George S. Zimmerman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9427) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Lane; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 9428) granting an increase of pension to George J. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9429) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 9430) authorizing the issuance of patent to the Pioneer Educational Society and its successors for certain lands in the diminished Colville Indian Reservation, State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 9431) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Worley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9432) granting an increase of pension to William H. Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 9433) granting an increase of pension to Isaac L. Prescott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 9434) for the relief of Harlan W. Jenks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9435) granting an increase of pension to George W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 9436) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Wiley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 9437) granting a pension to Minnie S. Muir; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9438) granting a pension to Richard R. Trench; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 9439) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. McCully; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9440) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Brunsteter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 9441) granting an increase of pension to James M. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 9442) granting a pension to Rose A. Doyle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 9443) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Buckle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9444) granting an increase of pension to Augustus B. Tickner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9445) to correct the military record of Oliver A. Campbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9446) granting an honorable discharge to Edward S. Conkling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 9447) granting an increase of pension to William Newton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9448) granting an increase of pension to William H. Kendall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 9449) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Holman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 9450) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Clune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9451) granting an increase of pension to George H. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9452) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Cartwright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9453) granting a pension to John D. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 9454) granting an increase of pension to John M. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND: Evidence in the case of James M. Snoddy, special pension bill (H. R. 9422); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petitions of Elmhurst Baptist Church, the Bible class of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, both of Elmhurst, N. Y., and of the Rosedale Presbyterian Church, Borough of Queens, New York City, urging the passage of a war-emergency prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution of the Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, asking the repeal of the zone system for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of F. C. Schutte (treasurer), F. E. Mosher, Hon. F. E. Detzell, and 12 employees of the Erie Trust Co., praying for the passage of H. R. 7995, for the preservation of the *Niagara*, Commodore Perry's flagship in the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Resolutions of the Merchants' Association of New York, advocating a board of war control subordinate only to the President, and a director of munitions, subject to the board of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the convention of short-line railroads, held in Washington, D. C., expressing approval of the taking over of the railroads of the country and suggesting amendments to Senate bill 3385; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of 15 veterans of the Civil War of Iuka, Ill., urging increase of pension for Civil War soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of the Asbury Park (N. J.) Chamber of Commerce, for the repeal of the zone system for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of a committee of the George H. Thomas Post, No. 84, Grand Army of the Republic, Lancaster, Pa., urging the enactment of legislation to increase the pension of veterans of the Civil War to \$50 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompanying House bill 9332, a bill to increase the pension of George W. Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution adopted by the board of directors of Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., concerning the proper punishment to be given those found guilty of attempt to destroy property in the United States, etc.; also, a petition of D. M. Gandier, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the enactment of legislation preventing the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic liquors during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John A. O'Connell, secretary Labor Temple, San Francisco, Cal., indorsing an increase in the pay of all civilian employees of the United States and of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of Headquarters Committee of the Anti-Saloon League of California, requesting the Congress of the United States immediately to prohibit the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic liquors, including wines and beers, for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of 150 members of the Wyoming County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging the adoption of war prohibition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Medina, N. Y., urging the adoption of immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of J. Harte Sawens and 50 other residents of Albion, N. Y., urging war prohibition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of I. A. Arnold and 42 other residents of Spencerport, N. Y., urging immediate prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William A. Day and 26 other residents of Livonia, N. Y., urging the adoption of immediate emergency war prohibition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of citizens of Winthrop, N. Y., favoring the emergency war prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Madrid, N. Y., favoring the emergency war prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Keeseville, N. Y., favoring the emergency war prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Winthrop, N. Y., indorsing the emergency war prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of ex-officers of the Civil War at the Veterans' Home, Napa County, Cal., favoring bills for the relief of Volunteer officers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Minneapolis (Minn.) Civic and Commerce Association, favoring passage of House bill 8172, relative to traffic on our inland waterways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Clay County (Minn.) Farm Bureau and pastor and members of First Methodist Church of Fosston, Minn., favoring legislation prohibiting manufacturing and sale of alcoholic liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Massachusetts Dental Society on Senate bill 3386; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of New York Publishers' Association (Inc.) on postal law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Massachusetts Audubon Society on Senate bill 1553; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of T. L. Lewis, Charleston, W. Va., on present coal situation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 1, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God of Hosts, lest we forget, impress us with the truth that if ever a permanent world-wide peace obtains, it must be based upon the eternal principles of true religious convictions.

Thou has revealed Thyself as the universal Father, and therefore its corollary, the universal brotherhood of mankind.

Thou openest Thine hand and satisfiest the desire of every living thing.

The world is large enough, productive enough for all Thy children.

War is destructive. Religion is constructive. War is hate, revenge. Religion is love, peace, good will. War is contrary to reason and common sense. Religion has its source in the largest conception of life, reason, justice, mercy. War is hell. Religion is heaven.

Inspire us and all the world with these fundamentals, that a world-wide peace may come, a blessing to mankind. For Thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory, forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one suggestion, as far as the Journal is concerned, before it is approved. The Journal states that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] offered a privileged report on a certain bill. The gentleman from Tennessee, as I understand it, did not seek to offer the bill and report as privileged, but merely asked unanimous consent to present the bill and the report and have it submitted as if it were placed in the basket. He did not claim it was privileged.

The SPEAKER. No; what the gentleman asked was to have it put on the Union Calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. He did not claim it was privileged, as the Journal states.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows he did not state it was privileged, but he asked unanimous consent to put it on the Union Calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Journal states that the gentleman from Tennessee presented a privileged report. He did not present a privileged report, and I ask that the Journal be corrected in that particular.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will be corrected in that respect.

There was no objection.

The Journal as corrected was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3006. An act to authorize and empower officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps to serve under the Government of the Dominican Republic, and for other purposes;

S. 3126. An act to provide temporary promotion for retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps performing active duty during the period of the present war;

S. 3427. An act for the relief of certain ex-paymasters' clerks; S. 3445. An act to authorize the payment of gun pointers and gun captains while temporarily absent from their regular stations, and for other purposes;

S. 3402. An act to fix the age limit for candidates for admission to the United States Naval Academy;

S. 3131. An act for the relief of Col. Littleton W. T. Waller, United States Marine Corps;

S. 3401. An act to authorize the President to reduce temporarily the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy;

S. 3129. An act to provide for the disposition of the effects of deceased persons in the naval service;

S. 3130. An act to amend section 1570 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 3400. An act to regulate the pay of retired chief warrant officers on active duty;

S. 3404. An act to authorize the President to drop from the rolls any Navy or Marine Corps officer absent without leave for three months, or who has been convicted of any offense by the civil authorities, and prohibiting such officer's reappointment; and

S. 3406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to determine where and when there are no public quarters available for officers of the Navy and Marine Corps.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting therein the message or address delivered by the President of the United States to the farmers of America.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing the address of the President of the United States to the farmers of America. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CIVIL-SERVICE EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 117.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. J. Res. 117 Joint resolution amending the act of July 2, 1909, governing the holding of civil-service examinations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the resolution reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act of July 2, 1909 (36 Stats. L., 1), is hereby amended so as to permit the United States Civil Service Commission, during the period of the war, to hold examinations of applicants for positions in the Government service in the District of Columbia, and to permit applicants from the several States and Territories of the United States to take said examinations in the said District of Columbia. Said examinations shall be permitted in addition to those required to be held by said act of July 2, 1909 (36 Stats. L., 1).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, for the present I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming objects.

NOTIFICATION OF ILLNESS OF SOLDIERS.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House joint resolution 228, now on the Speaker's table, which I ask to have reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows.

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 228) to provide notification of illness of soldier.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby directed, immediately upon the admission of an enlisted man or officer of the United States Army to an Army hospital in continental America, to notify by telegraph the nearest relative of such enlisted man or officer of such admission, stating the disease from which such soldier suffers and the condition of his illness, as to whether slight, serious, or critical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this resolution been reported by the committee?